PROPERTY OF THE Shelf No.
DS425.M96 1858
V. 3
Public Library of the City of Boston
SICUT PATRIBUS SIT DEUS NOBIS
BOSTONIA
CONDITA A.D.
1630.
QUINTUS REGNINE DONATA A.D. 1822.
From the Bates Fund.

ORIGINAL SANSKRIT TEXTS

ON THE

ORIGIN AND HISTORY

OF

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA,

THEIR RELIGION AND INSTITUTIONS.

COLLECTED, TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH,
AND ILLUSTRATED BY REMARKS,

CHIEFLY
FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS AND OTHERS IN INDIA.

BY

J. MUIR, D.C.L.,

LATE OF THE BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE.

+ 30232

V. 3

PART THIRD.

THE VEDAS: OPINIONS OF THEIR AUTHORS, AND OF LATER INDIAN WRITERS, IN REGARD TO THEIR ORIGIN, INSPIRATION, AND AUTHORITY.

633

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

M.DCCC.LXI.

*DS425
M96
1858
v.3

46738
Add June 21, 1861

HERTFORD:
Printed by STEPHEN AUSTIN, Fore Street.

PREFACE.

THE principal object which I have had in view in this volume, as in the two which preceded it, has been to assist the researches of those Hindus who may desire to investigate critically the most important points in the civil and religious history of their nation. Having shown in the First Part that the mythical and legendary accounts, given in the Puranas, etc., regarding the origin of the caste system which has long prevailed in India, are mutually contradictory and totally insufficient to establish the truth of the popular belief regarding the distinct creation of four separate tribes; and having endeavoured to prove, in the Second Part, by a variety of arguments, drawn chiefly from comparative philology and from the contents of the Rig-veda, that the Hindus are descended from a branch of the Indo-Germanic stock, which dwelt originally along with the other cognate races, in Central Asia, and subsequently migrated into Northern Hindustan, where the Brahmanical religion and institutions were developed and matured;—I now come, in this Third Part, to consider more particularly the history of the Vedas, regarded as the sacred Scriptures of the Hindus, and the inspired source *from* which their religious and philosophical systems (though, to a great extent, founded also on

reasoning and speculation) profess to be mainly derived; or *with* which, at least, they all pretend to be in harmony.

When I speak, however, of the *history* of the Veda, I am reminded that I am employing a term which will suggest to the philosophical reader the idea of a minute and systematic account of all the various opinions which the Indians have held in regard to their sacred books from the commencement, through all the successive stages of their theological development, down to the present time. To do anything like this, however, would be a task demanding an extent of research far exceeding that to which I can pretend. At some future time, indeed, we may hope that a history of the theological and speculative ideas of the Indians, which shall treat this branch also of the subject, may be written by some competent scholar. My own design is much more modest. I only attempt to show what are the opinions on the subject of the Veda, which have been entertained by certain distinct sets of writers whom I may broadly divide into three classes—(1) the mythological, (2) the scholastic, and (3) the Vedic.

The first, or mythological class, embraces the writers of the different Puranas and Itihāsas, and partially those of the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads, who, like the compilers of the Puranas, frequently combine the mythological with the theosophic element.

The second, or scholastic class, includes the authors of the different philosophical schools, or Darśanas, with their scholiasts and expositors, and the commentators on the Vedas. The whole of these writers belong

to the class of systematic or philosophical theologians; but as their speculative principles differ, it is the object of each particular school to explain and establish the origin and authority of the Vedas on grounds conformable to its own fundamental dogmas, as well as to expound the doctrines of the sacred books in such a way as to harmonise with its own special tenets.

The third class of writers, whose opinions in regard to the Vedas I have attempted to exhibit, is composed (1) of the rishis themselves, the authors of the Vedic hymns, and (2) of the authors of the Upanishads, which, though works of a much more recent date, and for the most part of a different character from the hymns, are yet regarded by later Indian writers as forming, equally with the latter, a part of the Veda. As the authors of the hymns, the earliest of them at least, lived in an age of simple conceptions, and of spontaneous and childlike devotion, we shall find that, though some of them appear, in conformity with the spirit of their times, to have regarded their compositions as in a certain degree the result of divine inspiration, their primeval and elementary ideas on this subject form a strong contrast to the artificial and systematic definitions of the later scholastic writers. And even the authors of the Upanishads, though they, in a more distinct manner, claim a superhuman authority for their own productions, are very far from recognizing the rigid classification which, at a subsequent period, divided the Vedic writings from all other religious works, by a broad line of demarcation.

It may conduce to the convenience of the reader, if I furnish here a brief survey of the opinions of the three

classes of writers above described, in regard to the Vedas, as these opinions are shown in the passages which are collected in the present volume. And this becomes the more expedient, as, since the body of this work was composed, I have discovered some additional texts of considerable importance, representing the tenets of the Mīmānsaka and Naiyāyika schools, either in fuller detail or under somewhat different aspects, which I have had to throw into an appendix, and to which it is therefore the more necessary that I should here draw the reader's attention in connection with the other texts of the same schools, which are cited in the earlier part of the collection.

The first chapter (p. 1-113) contains texts exhibiting the opinions on the origin, division, inspiration, and authority of the Vedas, which have been held by Indian authors subsequent to the collection of the Vedic Hymns, and consequently embraces the views of the first two of the classes of writers above specified, viz., (1) the mythological and (2) the scholastic. In the first Section (pp. 3-6), I adduce texts from the Śatapatha Brahmana, the Chhandogya Upanishad, and the Institutes of Manu, in which the first three Vedas are described as having been produced from fire, air, and the sun. In the second Section (pp. 6-12) are quoted two passages from the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas, which represent the four Vedas to have issued from the mouth of Brahmā at the creation; a third from the Vrihad Aranyaka Upanishad, which describes the Vedas, as well as other śāstras, as being the breath of Brahma; several from the Harivanśa, which speak of the Vedas as pro-

duced from the Gāyatrī, or as created by Brahmā; another from the Mahābhārata, which describes Sarasvatī as the mother of the Vedas; with two from the Rik and Atharva Vedas, one of which derives the Vedas from the mystical victim Purusha, and the other makes them spring from Time. In page 227 of the Appendix a second passage of the Atharva-veda is cited, in which the Vedas are declared to have sprung from the leavings of the sacrifice (*uchchhishṭa*). Another text is quoted from Manu, which describes the Vedas, along with certain other objects, as being the *second* manifestation of the *Sattva-guna*, or pure principle, while Brahma is one of its *first* manifestations. Two further quotations from the Vishnu Purana assert the eternity of the Veda and its oneness with Vishnu. The third Section (pp. 12-19) contains various passages from Manu, in which the great dignity, power, authority, and efficacy of the Veda are celebrated; together with two other texts from the same author and the Vishnu Purana, in which a certain impurity is predicated of the Sāma-veda; and two more from the Vāyu and Brahma-vaivartta Puranas, which derogate in some degree from the consideration of the Vedas, by setting up a counter claim to respect in favour of the Puranas. A further passage is quoted from the Mundaka Upanishad, in which the Vedas and their appendages are designated as the "inferior science," in contrast to the "superior science," the knowledge of Soul. The fourth Section (pp. 20-31) describes the division of the Vedas in the third or Dvāpara age, by Vedavyāsa and his four pupils, according to texts of the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Bhāgavata Puranas; and then ad-

duces a different account, asserting their division in the second or Tretā age, by the King Purūravas, according to another passage of the same Bhāgavata Purana, and a text of the Mahābhārata (though the latter is silent regarding Purūravas). Section fifth (pp. 31-39) contains passages from the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas and the Śatapatha Brahmana, regarding the schism between the adherents of the Yajur-veda, as represented by the different schools of Vaiśampāyana and Yājnavalkya, and quotes certain remarks of Prof. Weber on the same subject, with some other texts, as adduced and illustrated by that scholar, on the hostility of the Atharvanas towards the other Vedas, and of the Chhandogas towards the Rig-veda.

Section vi. (pp. 39-52) contains extracts from the works of Sāyana and Mādhava, the commentators on the Rik and Taittirīya Yajur Vedas, in which they both define the characteristics of the Veda, and state certain arguments in support of its authority. Sāyana (pp. 40-47), after noticing the objections urged against his views by persons of a different school, and defining the Veda as a work consisting of Mantra and Brahmana, asserts that it is not derived from any personal, or at least not from any human, author (compare note 39, p. 51); and rests its authority on its own declarations, on its self-proving power, on the smṛiti (*i.e.*, non-vedic writings of eminent saints), and on common notoriety. He then encounters some other objections raised against the Veda on the score of its containing passages which are unintelligible, dubious, absurd, contradictory, or superfluous. Mādhava (pp. 47-52) defines the Veda as the work which alone

reveals the supernatural means of attaining future felicity; explains that males only, belonging to the three superior castes, are competent to study its contents; and asserts that, inasmuch as it is eternal, it is a primary and infallible authority. This eternity of the Veda, however, he appears to interpret as not being absolute, but as dating from the first creation, when it was produced from Brahma, though, as he is free from defects, the Veda, as his work, is self-proved.

Section vii. (pp. 52-73) contains the views of Jaimini and Bādarayana the (alleged) authors of the Mīmānsā and Brahma (or Vedānta) Sūtras on the eternity of the Veda. Jaimini asserts that sound, or words, are eternal, that the connection between words and the objects they represent also, is not arbitrary or conventional, but eternal, and that consequently the Vedas convey unerring information in regard to unseen objects. This view he defends against the objections of the Naiyāyikas, insisting that the names, derived from those of certain sages, by which particular parts of the Vedas are designated, do not prove those sages to have been their authors, but merely their students; while none of the names occurring in the Veda are those of temporal beings, but all denote some objects which have existed eternally. Some of these notions are further enforced in a passage from the summary of the Mīmānsā doctrine, given in the Sarva-darśana-sangraha, which I have quoted in the Appendix (pp. 190-206). The writer first notices the Naiyāyika objections to the Mīmānsaka tenet that the Veda had no personal author, viz., (1) that any tradition to this effect must have been interrupted at the

past dissolution of the universe; (2) that it would be impossible to prove that *no one* had ever recollected any such author; (3) that the sentences of the Veda have the same character as all other sentences; (4) that the inference,—drawn from the present mode of transmitting the Vedas from teacher to pupil,—that the same mode of transmission must have gone on from eternity, breaks down by being equally applicable to any other book; (5) that the Veda is in fact ascribed to a personal author in a passage of the book itself; (6) that sound is not eternal, and that when we recognize letters as the *same* we have heard before, this does not prove their identity or eternity, but is merely a recognition of them as belonging to the same *species* as other letters we have heard before; (7) that though Parameśvara (God) is naturally incorporeal, he may have assumed a body in order to reveal the Veda, etc. The writer then states the Mīmānsaka answers to these arguments thus: What does this alleged 'production by a personal author' (*paurusheyatva*) mean? The Veda, if supposed to be so produced, cannot derive its authority (*a*) from inference (or reasoning), as fallible books employ the same process. Nor will it suffice to say (*b*) that it derives its authority from its truth: for the Veda is defined to be a book *which proves that which can be proved in no other way.* And even if Parameśvara (God) were to assume a body, he would not, *in that state of limitation*, have any access to supernatural knowledge. Further, the fact that different *śākhās* or recensions of the Vedas are called after the names of particular sages, proves no more than that these recensions were *studied* by those sages, and affords

no ground for questioning the eternity of the Vedas,—an eternity which is proved by the fact of our recognizing letters when we meet with them. These letters are the very identical letters we had heard before, for there is no evidence to show either that letters of the same sort (G's, for instance) are numerically different from each other, or that they are *generic terms, denoting a species.* The apparent differences which are observable in the same letter, result merely from the particular characteristics of the persons who utter it, and do not affect its identity. This is followed by further reasoning in support of the same general view; and the writer then arrives at the conclusion, which he seems to himself to have triumphantly established, that the Veda is underived and authoritative. After noticing the different grounds on which authoritativeness, and non-authoritativeness, respectively, are rested by the principal Indian schools, the Naiyāyika is next introduced as raising another difficulty, as to the self-dependent (or self-derived) authority which is claimed for the Veda. What, he asks, is the source of this self-dependent authority? He gives four conceivable definitions of what it may be supposed to mean, and shows to his own satisfaction that they are all untenable. The Mīmānsaka then interposes, and brings forward a fifth definition. His conclusion appears to be that authoritativeness springs from the constituents or totality of knowledge.

The question of the effect produced on the Vedas by the dissolutions of the world, which is raised among the other Naiyāyika objections above quoted, without receiving any solution in the Mīmānsaka reply, is noticed

in some extracts from Patanjali's Mahābhāshya and its commentators, which have been adduced by Prof. Goldstücker in the Preface to his Mānava-kalpa Sūtra, and have been partly reprinted in my Appendix (pp. 228 ff.). It is admitted by Patanjali, that, though the sense of the Veda is permanent, the order of their letters has not always remained the same, and that this difference is exhibited in the different recensions of the Kāthakas and other schools. Patanjali himself does not say what is the cause of this alteration in the order of the letters; but his commentator, Kaiyyata, states that the order was disturbed during the great dissolutions, etc., and had to be restored (though with variations) by the eminent science of the rishis. Kullūka and Sankara, on the other hand (see pp. 5, 72, and 213, note 10), maintain that the Veda was preserved (*unaltered*, I presume) in the memory of Brahmā during the periods of dissolution.

In the extract given in pp. 65-73 from his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras,[1] Śankara, while he follows the author of those Sūtras, and Jaimini, in basing the authority of the Vedas on the eternity of sound, finds it necessary to meet an objection that, as the gods mentioned in the Veda had confessedly an origin in time, the words which designate those gods cannot be eternal, but must have originated coevally with the created objects which they denote, since eternal words could not have an eternal connection with non-eternal objects. This difficulty he tries to overcome (by tacitly *abandoning the ground taken by Jaimini, that the Veda contains*

[1] My attention was drawn to this passage by an unpublished treatise by the Rev. Prof. Banerjea, of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

no references to non-eternal objects, and) by asserting that the eternal connection of words is not with *individual* objects, but with the *species* to which these objects belong, and that Indra and the other gods are proved by the Veda to belong to species. Śankara then goes on to assert, on the authority of Brahma Sūtra, i. 3, 28, fortified by various texts from the Vedas and the smṛitis, that the gods and the world generally are produced (though not in the sense of evolution out of a material cause) from the word of the Vedas (see p. 4, and note, pp. 4 and 5) in the form of *sphoṭa*. This last term will be explained below. It should also be noticed here that in another place (i. 1, 3) the Brahma Sūtras (see note 39, in pp. 51, 52) declare that Brahma was the source of the Veda, and that, on this foundation, Śankara argues that Brahma must be omniscient. If, however, the Vedas are eternal and apparently self-existent, it is not easy to see how they can be at the same time the work of Brahma, and a proof of his omniscience.[2]

In opposition to the tenets of the Mīmānsakas, who hold the eternity (or the eternal self-existence) of the Veda, and to the kindred dogmas of the Vedānta, as just expounded, Gotama, the author of the Nyāya aphorisms, denies (Section viii. pp. 73-81) the eternity of sound; and after vindicating the Veda from the charges of falsehood, self-contradiction, and tautology, deduces its authority from the authority of the wise, or competent,

[2] It is true that S'ankara gives an alternative interpretation of this Sūtra, viz., that it may be understood as meaning that the Vedas, etc., are "the source, or cause, or proof of Him, *i.e.*, by enabling us rightly to understand his nature." (*Yoniḥ kāraṇam pramāṇam asya Brahmaṇo yathāvat svarūpādhigame*). But the explanation given in the text is the first given, and it is not repudiated by S'ankara. See Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Vedānta, pp. 7-10.

person who was its author. It does not clearly appear from Gotama's aphorism who the wise person was whom he regards as the maker of the Veda. If he did not believe in a God, (see Appendix, note v. p. 216), he must have regarded the rishis as its authors. The later Naiyāyika writers, however, as the author of the Tarka Sangraha (Appendix, p. 209) and of the Kusumānjali (Appendix, pp. 211-216) clearly refer the Veda to Īśvara (God) as its framer. Udayana, the author of the Kusumānjali, controverts the opinion that the existence of the Veda from eternity can be proved by a continuous tradition, as such a tradition must, he says, have been interrupted at the dissolution of the world, which preceded the existing creation (see above, pp. xi. xiii.) He, therefore (as explained by his commentator), infers an eternal and omniscient author of the Veda; asserting that the Veda is *paurusheya*, or derived from a personal author; that many of its own texts imply this; and that the appellations given to its particular *śākhās* or recensions, are derived from the names of those sages whose persons were assumed by Īśvara, when he uttered them at the creation.

Kapila, the author of the Sānkhya Aphorisms (pp. 81-86), agrees with the Nyāya aphorist in denying the eternity of the Veda, but, in conformity with his own principles, differs from Gotama in denying its derivation from a personal (*i.e.*, here, a *divine*) author, because there was no person (*i.e.*, as his commentator explains, no God) to make it. Vishnu, the chief of liberated beings, though omniscient, could not, he argues, have made the Veda, owing to his impassive-

ness, and no other person could have done so from want of omniscience. And even if the Veda have been uttered by the primeval Purusha, it cannot be called his work, as it was breathed forth by him unconsciously. (Compare the passage from the Vedāntist Śankara, pp. 104 and 105.) Kapila agrees with Jaimini in ascribing a self-demonstrating power to the Veda, and differs from the Naiyāyikas in not deriving its authority from correct knowledge possessed by an utterer. He proceeds to controvert the existence of such a thing as *sphoṭa* (a modification of sound which is assumed by the Mīmānsakas, and described as single, indivisible, distinct from individual letters, existing in the form of words, and constituting a whole), and to deny the eternity of sound.

In the ninth Section (pp. 86-107) some short reasonings in support of the supernatural origin of the Veda are quoted from the Nyāya-mālā-vistara (a condensed account of the Mīmānsa system) and from the Vedārtha-prakāśa (the commentary on the Taittirīya Yajur-veda). The arguments in both passages (pp. 86-89) are to the same effect, and contain nothing that has not been already in substance anticipated in the preceding summaries of the Mīmānsa doctrine. In reference to their argument that no author of the Veda is remembered, I have noticed here that the supposition which an objector might urge, that the rishis, the acknowledged *utterers* of the hymns, might also have been their *authors*, is guarded against by the tenet, elsewhere maintained by Indian writers, that the rishis were merely *seers of the pre-existing sacred texts*. Some further passages are next

adduced (pp. 90-96) from the Nyāya-mālā-vistara, from Kullūka's commentary on Manu, and from Śankara Achāryya, to show that a distinct line of demarcation is drawn by the scholastic writers between the Veda, on the one hand, and all other classes of Indian scriptures, such as the smṛiti (including the Institutes of Manu, the Puranas, and Itihāsas, etc.), on the other, the *first* being regarded as an independent and infallible director, while the *others* are (in theory) held to be only authoritative guides, in so far as they are founded on, and coincide with, the Veda. The practical effect of this distinction is, however, much lessened by the fact that the ancient sages (such as Manu), the authors of the smṛitis, are looked upon as having had access to Vedic texts now no longer extant, as having held communion with the gods, and as having enjoyed a clearness of intuition into divine mysteries which is denied to later mortals. Śankara, however (as shewn in pp. 97-99), does not regard all the ancients as having possessed this infallible insight into truth, but exerts all his ingenuity to explain away the claims (though sanctioned by an Upanishad) of Kapila, who was not orthodox, according to his Vedantic standard, to rank as an authority. In his depreciation of Kapila, however, Śankara is opposed to the Bhāgavata Purana and other standard works (pp. 99-100). I then proceed to observe (pp. 101-103) that though in ancient times the authors of the different philosophical systems (*Darśanas*) no doubt asserted the truth of their respective opinions, in opposition to all the antagonistic systems, yet in modern times the superior orthodoxy of the Vedānta appears to be

generally recognized; while the authors of the other systems are regarded, *e.g.*, by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, as, amid all their diversities, having in view, as their ultimate scope, the support of the Vedāntic theory. The same view, in substance, is taken by Vijnāna Bhixu, the commentator on the Sānkhya Sūtras, who (Appendix, pp. 217-226) maintains that Kapila's system, though atheistic, is not irreconcilable with the Vedānta and other theistic schools, as its denial of an Īśvara (God) is only practical, or regulative, and merely enforced in order to withdraw men from the too earnest contemplation of an eternal and perfect Deity, which would impede their study of the distinction between matter and spirit. To teach men this discrimination as the great means of attaining final liberation, is one of the two main objects, and strong points, of the Sānkhya philosophy, and here it is authoritative; while its atheism is admitted to be its weak side, and on this subject it has no authority. Vijnāna Bhixu goes on to say that it is even supposable that theistic systems, in order to prevent sinners from attaining knowledge, may lay down doctrines partially opposed to the Vedas; and that though in these portions they are erroneous, they will still possess authority in the portions conformable to the *śruti* and *smṛiti*. He then quotes a passage from the Padma Purāna, in which the god Siva tells his consort Pārvatī that the Vaiśeshika, the Nyāya, the Sānkhya, the Purva-mīmānsā Darśanas, and the Vedāntic theory of illusion, are all systems infected by the dark or *tāmasa* principle, and consequently more or less unauthoritative. All theistic theories, however, are, as Vijnāna Bhixu

considers, authoritative, and free from error on their own special subject. And as respects the discrepancy between the Sānkhya and the Vedānta, regarding the unity of Soul, he concludes that the former is not devoid of authority, as the apparent diversity of Souls is acknowledged by the Vedānta, and the discriminative knowledge which the Sánkhya teaches to the embodied soul is an instrument of liberation; and thus the two varying doctrines, if regarded as the one practical (or regulative), and the other real (or transcendental), will not be contradictory.

After thus deviating into the Appendix, I revert to the close of Section ninth (pp. 103-109) where it is shewn that the distinction drawn by the Indian commentators between the superhuman Veda and its human appendages, the Kalpa Sūtras, etc., as well as the *smṛitis*, is not borne out by certain texts which I have cited from the Vṛihad Āranyaka and Mundaka Upanishads. These two ancient treatises seem to place all the different sorts of *'sāstras* or scriptures (including the four Vedas) in one and the same class, the former speaking of them all promiscuously as being the breath of Brahma, while the latter describes them all (except the Upanishads) as being parts of the "inferior science," in opposition to the "superior science," or knowledge of Brahma. In the same spirit as the Mundaka, the Chhandogya Upanishad also, as quoted in the Appendix (pp. 186, 187), includes the four Vedas in the same list with a variety of miscellaneous *'sāstras* (which Nārada has studied without getting beyond the confines of exoteric knowledge), and never intimates (unless it be by placing

them at the head of the list) that the former can claim any superiority over the other works with which they are associated.

In Section tenth (pp. 107-113) the arguments in support of the Veda, adduced in the philosophical systems, and by the various commentators, as above summarised, are recapitulated, and some remarks are made on these reasonings. My observations are chiefly directed to shew that the rishis are proved by the contents of the hymns to have been their real authors; and that numerous events which have occurred *in time*, are undoubtedly mentioned in the Vedas. This, as we have seen (above, p. xiv.) is admitted by Śankara.

The Second Chapter (pp. 114-183) exhibits the opinions of the rishis in regard to the origin of the Vedic hymns. It is intended to shew in detail that, though some at least of the rishis appear to have imagined themselves to be inspired by the gods in the expression of their religious emotions and ideas, they at the same time regarded the hymns as their own compositions, or the compositions of their forefathers, distinguishing between them as new and old, and describing their own authorship in terms which could only have been dictated by a consciousness of its reality. The first, second, and third Sections (pp. 116-140) contain a collection of passages from the Rig-veda in which a distinction is drawn (1) between the rishis as ancient and modern, and (2) between the hymns as older and more recent; and in which (3) the rishis describe themselves as the *makers*, *fabricators*, or *generators* of the hymns; with some additional texts in

which such authorship appears to be implied, though it is not expressed. Section fourth (pp. 141-164) contains a variety of passages from the same Veda, in which (1) a superhuman character or supernatural faculties are ascribed to the earlier rishis; (2) the idea is expressed that the praises and ceremonies of the rishis were suggested and directed by the gods in general, or, in particular, by the goddess of speech, or by some other or others of the different deities of the Vedic pantheon. To illustrate, and render more intelligible and probable, the opinions which I have ascribed to the old Indian rishis, regarding their own inspiration, I have quoted (in the same Section, pp. 165-171) a number of passages from Hesiod and Homer to shew that the early Greek bards entertained a similar belief. I then advert (pp. 170-171) to the remarkable divergence between the later religious histories of Greece and of India. I next enquire briefly (in pp. 171-172) in what way we can reconcile the apparently conflicting ideas of the rishis on the subject of the hymns, considered, on the one hand, as their own productions, and, on the other, as inspired by the gods. Then follow (pp. 172-176) some further texts from the Rig-veda, in which a mystical, magical, or supernatural efficacy is ascribed to the hymns. These are succeeded (pp. 177-181) by a few quotations from the same Veda, in which the authors complain of their own ignorance; and by a reference to the contrast between these humble confessions, and the proud pretensions set up by later theologians in behalf of the Veda, and its capability of imparting universal knowledge. The ideas of the rishis regarding their own

inspiration differ widely from the conceptions of later theorists; for while the former looked upon the gods, who were confessedly *mere created beings*, as the sources of supernal illumination, the latter either regard the Veda as eternal, or refer it to the eternal Brahma, or Īśvara, as its author. The fifth and last Section (pp. 181-183) adduces some texts from the Śvetāśvatara, Mundaka and Chhāndogya Upanishads, which show the opinions of the writers regarding their own inspiration, or that of their predecessors.

I have stated above that my primary design in the composition of this work, has been to aid the researches of Indian students and their European preceptors. But the volume, with all its imperfections, may perhaps also possess a certain interest for the divine and the philosopher, as furnishing a few documents to illustrate the course of theological opinion in a sphere far removed from the ordinary observation of the European student,—a course which, quite independently of the merits of the different tenets involved in the enquiry, will, I think, be found to present a remarkable parallel in various respects to that which is traceable in the history of those religious systems with which we are most familiar. In both cases we find that a primitive age of ardent emotion, of simple faith, and of unarticulated beliefs, was succeeded by a period of criticism and speculation, when the floating materials handed down by preceding generations were compared, classified, reconciled, developed into their consequences, and elaborated into a variety of scholastic systems.

For an account of the printed works or MSS. from which my Sanskrit extracts have been made, I may refer to the Prefaces of the First and Second Parts. And sources not there mentioned, are, I think, specified in the body of the work.

In regard to the texts quoted from the Rig-veda, I have derived the same sort of assistance from the French version of M. Langlois, which has been acknowledged in the Preface to the Second Part, p. vi. I am also indebted for some of the Vedic texts to Boehtlingk and Roth's Lexicon.

In this volume, as the reader will perceive, the Sanskrit extracts are entirely printed in the Roman character. I have no abstract preference for this mode of presenting Indian words; but its adoption has saved me much labour in the way of transcription, and it has also the advantage of being somewhat more economical.

CONTENTS.

PAGES

v.—xxiv. PREFACE.

1—113. CHAPTER I. OPINIONS REGARDING THE ORIGIN, DIVISION, INSPIRATION, AND AUTHORITY OF THE VEDAS, HELD BY INDIAN AUTHORS SUBSEQUENT TO THE COLLECTION OF THE HYMNS.

1— 6. SECT. I. Elemental Origin of the Vedas according to the Brahmanas, Upanishads, and Institutes of Manu.

6— 12. SECT. II. Origin of the Vedas according to the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas, the Vṛihad Āraṇyaka Upanishad, the Harivaṅśa, the Mahābhārata, the Rig and Atharva Vedas; eternity of the Veda; miscellaneous statements regarding it.

12— 19. SECT. III. Manu's conception of the dignity and authority of the Veda, with some statements of a different tenor from him and other writers.

20— 31. SECT. IV. Division of the Vedas, according to the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Bhāgavata Puranas, and the Mahābhārata.

31— 39. SECT. V. Accounts in the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas of the schism between the adherents of the Yajur-veda, Vaiśampāyana, and Yajñavalkya; hostility of the Atharvaṇas towards the other Vedas; and of the Chhandogas towards the Rig-veda.

39— 52. SECT. VI. Reasonings of the Commentators on the Vedas, in support of the authority of the Vedas.

52— 73. SECT. VII. Arguments of the Mīmānsakas and Vedantins in support of the eternity and authority of the Vedas.

73— 86. SECT. VIII. Arguments of the followers of the Nyāya and Sānkhya systems in support of the authority of the Vedas, but against the eternity of sound, and of the Vedas

86—107. SECT. IX. Some further reasonings in support of the supernatural origin of the Veda, and distinction in point of authority between it and the Smṛitis or non-vedic S'āstras, as stated by the commentators on the Taittirīya Yajur-veda, the Pūrva Mīmānsā, Manu, and the Vedanta;

PAGES

difference of opinion between S'ankara and Madhusūdana, regarding the orthodoxy of Kapila and Kaṇāda; the distinction in point of authority between the Vedas and the other S'āstras, drawn by later writers, not borne out by the Upanishads.

107—113. Sect. X. Recapitulation of the arguments urged in the Darśanas, and by commentators, in support of the authority of the Vedas, with some remarks on their reasonings.

114—183. CHAPTER II. The Rishis, and their opinions in regard to the Origin of the Vedic Hymns.

116—120. Sect. I. Passages from the Hymns of the Veda which distinguish between the Rishis as Ancient and Modern.

121—128. Sect. II. Passages from the Veda in which a distinction is drawn between the older and the more recent Hymns.

128—140. Sect. III. Passages of the Rig-veda in which the Rishis describe themselves as the composers of the Hymns, or intimate nothing to the contrary.

141—181. Sect. IV. Passages of the Rig-veda in which a snpernatural character is ascribed to the Rishis or the Hymns; similar conceptions of inspiration entertained by the Greeks of the Homeric age; limitations of this opinion in the case of the Vedic Rishis.

181—183. Sect. V. Texts from the Upanishads, showing the opinions of the authors regarding their own inspiration, or that of their predecessors.

185—231. Appendix.

185—190. Note I. on Page 19, Line 22, containing texts from the Bhagavad Gīta, the Chhāndogya and Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishads, and the Bhāgavata Purana, depreciatory of the ceremonial and polytheistic parts of the Veda, in comparison with the knowledge of Brahma.

190. Note II. on Page 22, Line 14. Quotation from Mahīdhara's Commentary on the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā, regarding the division of the Vedas.

190—209. Note III. on Page 65, 4th Line from the foot. Extracts (1) from the Sarva-darśana-sangraha, on the Mīmānsaka arguments regarding the eternity of the Veda; (2) from S'ankara's Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras; and (3) from the Vidvan-moda-taraṅgiṇī, attributing atheism to the Mīmānsā.

209—210. Note IV. on Page 80, Line 18. Extracts from the Tarka-sangraha, regarding the grounds on which the authority of the Veda, and of the other Scriptures, respectively rests. Vātsāyana's definition of the word *āpta*, etc.

PAGES

210—216. Note V. on Page 81, Line 13. Extracts from the Kusumānjali, controverting the eternity of the Veda, and ascribing its composition to an eternal and personal God.

216—217. Note VI. on Page 89, Line 12. Quotation from the Nyāya Sūtras, i. 49, regarding the technical term *kālātyayāpadishṭa*.

217. Note VII. on Page 90, Line 19. Indication of an additional illustrative text.

217—226. Note VIII. on Page 103, Line 9. Extract from the Sānkhya Pravachana Bhāshya (on the reconcilableness of the Sānkhya doctrines with those of the Vedanta and Yoga), embracing various quotations from the Padma-purāna, and other works.

226. Note IX. on Page 112, Line 22. Extract from Sāyana's Introduction to R. V.

226. Note X. on Page 126, Line 15. Quotation from R. V. x. 57, 3, = V. S. 3, 59.

227. Note XI. on Page 148, 4th Line from the foot. Reference to R. V. x. 90, 9, and to A. V. xix. 54, 3, and xi. 7, 24.

227. Note XII. on Page 149, 3rd Line from the foot. Reference to Professor Benfey's note on S. V. ii. 294.

227. Note XIII. on Page 176, Line 12. Quotations from R. V. x. 57, 2, and Taittirīya Brahmana.

228—231. Additional Note on Page 5, Line 15. Extracts from Patanjali's Mahābhāshya and its commentators, and from the Preface to Prof. Goldstücker's Mānava-kalpa-sūtra, on the changes undergone by the Veda during the dissolutions of the universe.

CORRECTIONS AND EMENDATIONS.

Page 32, Line 23, *for* "Brahmarāti," *read* "Brahmarāta."

„ 57, „ 7, „ "*yaugayadyam*," *read* "*yaugapadyam*."

„ 70, „ 27, „ "*senapāti*," *read* "*senāpati*."

„ 97, „ 27, „ "employs the words," *read* "employs the words (xii. 91)."

„ 102, „ 13, „ "Brahma," *read* "Brahmā."

„ 112, „ 33, „ "supposed," *read* "imagined."

„ 136, „ 26, „ "*prinaithe* [?]," *read* "*prinaithe*."[1]

„ 149, „ 35, „ "*devebhyaḥ-devana*," *read* "*devebhyaḥ = devana*."

„ 158, „ 34, „ "interests," *read* "intellects."

„ 162, „ 17, „ "A. V." *read* "R. V."

„ 197, „ 36, „ "*recessus*," *read* "*regressus*."

[1] This, I find, is a correct Vedic form. See Wilson's Sanskrit Grammar, 2nd ed., p. 464.

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

ORIGINAL SANSKRIT TEXTS.

PART THIRD.

CHAPTER I.

OPINIONS REGARDING THE ORIGIN, DIVISION, INSPIRATION, AND AUTHORITY OF THE VEDAS, HELD BY INDIAN AUTHORS SUBSEQUENT TO THE COLLECTION OF THE HYMNS.

In the preceding volume, I have furnished a general account of the ancient Indian writings, which are comprehended under the designation of Veda or Śruti. These works, which, as we have seen, constitute the earliest literature of the Hindus, are broadly divisible into two classes: (1) The Mantras or hymns, in which the praises of the gods are sung and their blessing is invoked; (2) the Brahmanas, which embrace both the liturgical institutes in which the ceremonial application of those hymns is prescribed, and the Āranyakas and Upanishads, or theological treatises in which the spiritual aspirations which were gradually developed in the minds of the more devout of the Indian sages are preserved. It is, therefore, clear that the hymns constitute the original and, in some respects, the most essential portion of the Veda; that the Brahmanas arose out of the hymns, and are subservient to their employment for the purposes of worship; while the Upanishads give expression to ideas of a spiritual and mystical character which, though to some extent discoverable in the hymns and in the older portion of the Brahmanas, are much further matured, and assume a more exclusive importance, in these later treatises.

I content myself at present with referring the reader who

desires to obtain a fuller idea of the nature of the hymns, and of the attributes there ascribed to the divinities to whom they are addressed, to the late Professor H. H. Wilson's translation of the earlier portion of the Rig-veda, and to the dissertation which he has prefixed to the first volume. At a later stage of this work, I hope to return to the mythology of the Veda, and to compare the conceptions which the rishis entertained of the different objects of their worship, with those representations of the deities who bore the same names, which occur in Indian writings of a later date, whether mythological or theological.

The task to which I propose in the meantime to devote myself, is to supply some account of the opinions entertained by Hindu writers, ancient and modern, in regard to the origin and authority of the Vedas. With this view I intend to collect from the Indian writings of the later Vedic era (the Brahmanas and Upanishads) as well as from the books, whether popular or scientific, of the post-vedic period (the Puranas, the Itihasas, the institutes of Manu, the commentaries on the Vedas, the aphorisms of the Darśanas, or systems of philosophy, and their commentators) such passages as refer to the origin, division, inspiration, and authority of the Vedas, and to compare the opinions there set forth with the ideas entertained on some of these subjects by the writers of the hymns themselves, as discoverable from numerous passages in their own compositions.

The mythical accounts which are given of the origin of the Vedas are mutually conflicting. In some passages they are said to have sprung from fire, air, and the sun. In other texts they are said to have been produced by the creator Brahmā from his different mouths, or by the intervention of the Gāyatrī, or to have sprung from the goddess Sarasvatī. I proceed to adduce these several passages.

SECT. I.—*Elemental origin of the Vedas according to the Brahmanas, Upanishads, and Institutes of Manu.*

I commence with a passage from the Śatapatha Brahmana, xi. 5, 8, 1 ff. *Prajāpatir vā idam agre āsīt | Eka eva so 'kāmayata syām prajāyeya iti | So 'śrāmyat sa tapo 'tapyata | tasmāch chrāntāt tepānāt trayo lokā asṛijyanta | pṛithivy antarixaṁ dyauḥ | sa imāṁs trīṇ lokān abhitatāpa | tebhyas taptebhyas trīṇi jyotīṁshy ajāyanta agnir yo 'yam pavate sūryaḥ | sa imāni trīṇi jyotīṁshy abhitatāpa | tebhyas taptebhyas trayo vedā ajāyanta agner ṛigvedo vāyor yajurvedaḥ sūryāt sāmavedaḥ | sa imāṁs trīn vedān abhitatāpa | tebhyas taptebhyas trīṇi śukrāny ajāyanta bhūr ity ṛigvedād bhuva iti yajurvedāt svar iti sāmavedāt | Tad ṛigvedenaiva hotram akurvata | yajurvedena ādhvaryavaṁ sāmavedena udgīthaṁ yad eva trayyai vidyāyai śukraṁ tena brahmatvam uchchakrāma.* "Prajāpati was formerly this universe [*i.e.* the sole existence]. Being alone, he desired, 'may I be, may I become.' He toiled, he performed austerity. From him, when he had so toiled, and performed austerity, three worlds were created,—earth, atmosphere, and sky. He brooded over [*i.e.* infused warmth into] these three worlds. From them, thus brooded over, three lights were produced,—fire, this which purifies (*i.e. pavana*, or the air), and the sun. He brooded over these three lights. From them so brooded over, the three Vedas were produced,—the Rig-veda from fire, the Yajur-veda from air, and the Sāma-veda from the sun. He brooded over these three Vedas. From them so brooded over, three seeds [or essences] were produced,—*bhūr* from the Rig-veda, *bhuvaḥ* from the Yajur-veda, and *svar* from the Sāma-veda. Hence, with the Rig-veda they performed the function of the hotṛi; with the Yajur-veda, the office of the adhvaryu; with the Sāma-veda, the duty of the udgatri; while the function of the brahman arose through the essence of the triple science [*i.e.* the three Vedas combined]."

Chhāndogya Upanishad.—A similar passage (already quoted

in Part Second, p. 200) occurs in the Chhāndogya Upanishad (p. 288 of Dr. Röer's Ed.) *Prajāpatir lokān abhyatapat | teshāṁ tapyamānānāṁ rasān prābṛihad agnim pṛithivyā vāyum antarixād ādityaṁ divaḥ | sa etās tisro devatā abhyatapat | tāsāṁ tapyamānānāṁ rasān prābṛihad agner ṛicho vāyor yajūṁshi sāma ādityāt | sa etāṁ trayīṁ vidyām abhyatapat | tasyās tapyamānāyā rasān prābṛihad bhūr iti ṛigbhyo bhuvar iti yajurbhyaḥ svar iti sāmabhyaḥ.* "Prajāpati brooded over the worlds, and from them so brooded over, he drew forth their essences, viz., fire from the earth, air from the atmosphere, and the sun from the sky. He brooded over these three deities, and from them, so brooded over, he drew forth their essences,—from fire the Rik verses, from air the Yajush verses, and from the sun the Sāma verses. He then brooded over this triple science, and from it, so brooded over, he drew forth the essences,—from Rik verses the syllable *bhūr*, from Yajush verses *bhuvaḥ*, and from Sāma verses *svar*."[1]

Manu.—The same origin is assigned to the three Vedas in the following verses, from the account of the creation in Manu i. 21—23, where the idea is no doubt borrowed from the Brahmanas:—*Sarveshāntu sa nāmāni karmāṇicha pṛithak pṛithak | Veda-śabdebhya evādau pṛithak saṁsthāścha nirmame | Karmātmanāñcha devānāṁ so 'sṛijat prāniṇām prabhuḥ | sādhyānāṁcha gaṇaṁ sūxmaṁ yajñañchaiva sanātanam | Agni-vāyuravibhyastu trayam brahma sanātanam | dudoha yajñasiddhyartham ṛig-yajuḥ-sāma-laxaṇam.* "He [Brahmā] in the beginning fashioned from the words of the Veda[2] the names, functions,

[1] Passages to the same effect are to be found in the Aitareya (v. 32—34) and Kaushītakī Brahmanas. The latter is translated by Weber in his Ind. Stud. ii. 303, ff.

[2] Kullūka wrongly explains this to mean, "Having understood them from the words of the Veda (*Veda-śabdebhya eva avagamya*)." It is similarly said in the Vishnu Pur. i. 5, 58, ff. (p. 43 of Wilson's Trans.) *Nāma rūpañcha bhūtānāṁ krityānāñcha pravarttanam | Veda-śabdebhya evādau devādīnāṁ chakāra saḥ | ṛishīṇāṁ nāmadheyāni yathā-veda-śrutāni vai | yathā-niyoga-yogyāni sarveshām api so 'karot.* "In the beginning he ordained, from the words of the Veda, the names, forms, and functions of the gods and other creatures. He also assigned the names and the respective offices of all the rishis, as handed down by the Vedas." The same idea is repeated in

and conditions of all [creatures]. That Lord also created the subtile order of active and living deities, and of Sādhyas, and eternal sacrifice. And in order to the performance of sacrifice, he drew forth from fire, from air, and from the sun, the triple eternal Veda, distinguished as Rik, Yajush, and Sāman."

Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, the commentator, annotates thus on this passage :—*Sanātanaṁ nityam | vedāpaurusheyatva-paxo Manor abhimataḥ | pūrva-kalpe ye vedās te eva Paramātma-mūrtter Brahmaṇaḥ sarvajñasya smṛity-ārūḍhāḥ | tān eva kalpādāv agni-vāyu-ravibhya āchakarsha | srautaścha ayam artho na śaṅkanīyaḥ | tathācha śrutiḥ | 'agner ṛigvedo vāyor yajurveda ādityāt sāmaveda' iti.* "The word *sanātana* means 'eternally pre-existing.' The doctrine of the superhuman origin of the Vedas is maintained by Manu. The same Vedas which [existed] in the previous mundane era (*Kalpa*) were preserved in the memory of the omniscient Brahmā, who was one with the supreme spirit. It was those same Vedas that, in the beginning of the [present] *Kalpa*, he drew forth from fire, air, and the sun: and this dogma which is founded upon the Veda is not to be questioned, for the Veda says, 'The Rig-veda comes from fire, the Yajur-veda from air, and the Sāma-veda from the sun.'"

Another commentator on Manu, Medhātithi, explains this passage in a more rationalistic fashion, "by remarking that the

the Mahābhārata, S'āntiparva, 8,533 :—*Ṛishayas tapasā vedān adhyaishanta divā-niśam | Anādinidhanā vidyā vāg utsṛishṭā svayambhuvā | Adau vedamayī divyā yataḥ sarvāḥ pravṛittayaḥ | Ṛishīṇāṁ nāmadheyāni yāścha vedeshu sṛishtayaḥ | Nānārū-pañcha bhūtānām karmaṇāñcha pravarttayan [pravarttanam ?] | Vedaśabdebhya evādau nirmimīte sa īśvaraḥ.* "Through devotion the rishis studied the Vedas both day and night. In the beginning, wisdom, without beginning or end, divine speech, formed of the Vedas, was sent forth by Svayambhū [the self-existent] : from her all activities [are derived]. It is from the words of the Veda that that Lord in the beginning frames the names of the rishis, the creations which are [recorded ?] in the Vedas, the various forms of beings, and species of works." In his introductory verses, Mādhava, the author of the Vedārtha-prakāśa, or Commentary on the Taittirīya Saṁhitā, thus addresses Mahādeva :—*Yasya niśvasitaṁ vedā yo vedebhyo 'khilaṁ jagat | Nirmame tam ahaṁ vande vidyātīrtham Maheśvaram.* "I reverence Maheśvara, the hallowed abode of sacred knowledge, whose breath the Vedas are, and who from the Vedas formed the whole universe." We shall meet this idea again further on.

Rig-veda opens with a hymn to fire, and the Yajur-veda with one in which air is mentioned."—Colebr. Misc. Ess. i. p. 11, note.

To the verses from Manu (i. 21—23) just cited, the following from the second book may be added, partly for the purpose of completing the parallel with the passages previously adduced from the Śatapatha Brahmana and the Chhāndogya Upanishad; —Manu ii. 76, ff. *Akārañchāpy ukārañcha makārañcha Prajāpatiḥ | Vedatrayād niraduhad bhūr-bhuvaḥ-svar itīti cha | 77. Tribhya eva tu vēdebhyaḥ pādam pādam adūduhat | tad ity ṛicho'syāḥ sāvitryāḥ parameshṭhī prajāpatiḥ | . . . 81. Oṁkāra-pūrvikās tisro maḥāvyāhṛitayo 'vyayāḥ | Tripadā chaiva gāyatrī vijñeyaṁ brahmaṇo mukham.* 76. "Prajāpati also milked out of the three Vedas the letters *a*, *u*, and *m*, together with the words *bhūr*, *bhuvaḥ*, and *svar*. 77. The same supreme Prajāpati also milked from each of the three Vedas one of the [three] lines of the text called *sāvitrī* [or *gāyatrī*], beginning with the word *tad*.[3] 81. The three great imperishable particles (*bhūr*, *bhuvaḥ*, *svar*) preceded by *om*, and the *gāyatrī* of three lines, are to be regarded as the mouth of the Veda [or Brahma]."

SECT. II.—*Origin of the Vedas according to the Vishṇu and Bhāgavata Puranas, the Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad, the Harivaṅśa, the Mahābhārata, the Rig and Atharva Vedas; eternity of the Veda; miscellaneous statements regarding it.*

In the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas we find a quite different tradition regarding the origin of the Vedas, which in these works are said to have been created by the four-faced Brahma from his several mouths. Thus the Vishnu Pur. says, i. 5, 48, ff.:—*Gāyatrañcha ṛichaśchaiva trivṛit-sāma-rathantaram | Agnishṭomañcha yajñānāṁ nirmame prathamād mukhāt | yajūṁshi traishṭubhaṁ chhandaḥ stomaṁ pañchadaśaṁ tathā | Vṛihat sāma tathokthañcha daxiṇād asṛijad mukhāt | sāmāni jagatīchhandaḥ stomaṁ saptadaśaṁ tathā | vairūpam atirātraṁ-*

[3] This text, Rig-veda iii. 62, 10, will be quoted in the sequel.

cha paśchimād asṛijad mukhāt | ekaviṁśam atharvāṇam āptor-yāmāṇam evacha | Anushṭubhaṁ sa vairājam uttarād asṛijad mukhāt. "From his first mouth Brahma formed the *gayātra*, the *ṛik* verses, the *trivṛit*, the *sāma-rathantara*. From his southern mouth he created the *yajush* verses, the *trishṭubh* metre, the *panchadaśa-stoma*, the *vṛihat-sāma*, and the *ukthas*. From his western mouth he formed the *sāma* verses, the *jagatī* metre, the *saptadaśa-stoma*, the *vairūpa*, and the *atirātra*. From his northern mouth he framed the *ekaviṅśa*, the *atharvan*, with the *anushṭubh* and *virāj* metres."[4]

In like manner it is said, but with variations, in the Bhāgavata Purana iii. 12, 34, and 37 ff.:—*Kadāchid dhyāyataḥ srashṭur vedā āsaṁṡ chaturmukhāt | kathaṁ sraxyāmyahaṁ lokān samavetān yathā purā | . . . Ṛig-yajuḥ-sāmātharvākhyān vedān pūrvādibhir mukhaiḥ | śastram iǰyāṁ stutistomam prāyaśchittam vyadhāt kramāt.* "Once the Vedas sprang from the four-faced creator, as he was meditating 'how shall I create the aggregate worlds as before?' . . . He formed from his eastern and other mouths the Vedas called Rik, Yajush, Sāman, and Atharvan, together with praise, sacrifice, hymns, and expiation." And in verse 45 it is stated that the *ushṇih* metre issued from his hairs, the *gāyatrī* from his skin, the *trishṭubh* from his flesh, the *anushṭubh* from his tendons, the *jagatī* from his bones." (*Tasyoshṇig āsīl lomebhyo gayātrīcha tvacho vibhoḥ | trishṭup māṁsāt snuto 'nushṭup jagaty asthnaḥ Prajāpateḥ.*)

Vṛihad Āranyaka.—According to the following passage of the Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad (p. 455 of Röer's Ed. and p. 179 of Trans.=Śatapatha Brahmana, p. 1064) the Vedas, as well as other śāstras are the breath of Brahma:—*Sa yathā ārdrendhāgner abhyāhitāt pṛithag dhūmā viniścharanti evaṁ vā are 'sya mahato bhūtasya niśvasitam etad yad ṛigvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo 'tharvāṅgirasa itihāsaḥ purāṇaṁ vidyā upanishadaḥ ślokāḥ*

[4] See Wilson's Trans. p. 42. As it is sufficient for my purpose that certain parts of the different Vedas are intended by the several terms employed in this passage, I have left them all untranslated.

sutrāṇy anuvyākhyānāni vyākhyānāni asyaiva etāni sarvāṇi niśvasitāni. "As from a fire made of moist wood various modifications of smoke proceed, so is the breathing of this great Being the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Atharvāṅgirases, the Itihāsas, Puranas, science, the Upanishads, verses (*slokas*), aphorisms, comments of different kinds—all these are his breathings."[5]

It is curious that in this passage the Vedas appear to be classed in the same category with various other works, such as the Śūtras, from some at least of which (as we shall see further on), they are broadly distinguished by later writers, who regard the former (including the Brahmanas and Upanishads) as of superhuman origin, while this character is expressly denied to the latter, which are represented as *paurusheya*, or merely human compositions.

Harivanśa.—In the first section of the Harivanśa, v. 47, the creation of the Vedas by Brahmā is thus briefly alluded to:—*Ṛicho yajūṁshi sāmāni nirmame yajñasiddhaye | sādhyās tair ayajan devān ity evam anuśuśruma.* "In order to the accomplishment of sacrifice, he formed the Rik, Yajush, and Sāma verses: with these the Sādhyās worshipped the gods, as we have heard."

The following is a more particular account of the same event given in another part of the same work; Harivanśa, verse 11,516:—*Tato 'sṛijad vai tripadām gāyatrīm vedamātaram | Akarochchaiva chaturo vedān gāyatri-sambhavān.* After framing the world, Brahmā "next created the *gāyatrī* of three lines,

[5] In another part of the same Upanishad (pp. 50—53 of Dr. Röer's Ed.) Prajāpati [identified with Death, or the Devourer] is said to have produced *vāch* (speech), and through her, together with Soul, to have created all things, including the Vedas:—*sa tayā vāchā tena ātmanā idaṁ sarvam asṛijata yad idaṁ kiñcha ṛicho yajūṁshi sāmāni chhandāṁsi yajñān prajāḥ paśūn.* "By that speech and that soul he created all things whatsoever, Rik, Yajush, and Sāma texts, metres, sacrifices, creatures, animals." And in a subsequent text of the same work (p. 290) it is said:—*Trayo vedā ete eva | vāgeva ṛig-vedo mano yajur-vedaḥ prānaḥ sāma-vedaḥ.* "The three Vedas are [identifiable with] these three things [speech, mind, and life]. Speech is the Rig-veda; mind the Yajur-veda; and life, the Sāma-veda."

mother of the Vedas, and also the four Vedas which sprang from the *gāyatrī*."

A little further on we find this expanded into the following piece of mysticism, verse 11,665, ff. :—*Samāhita-manā Brahmā moxaprāptena hetunā | chandra-maṇḍala-saṁsthānāj jyotistejo mahat tadā | Praviśya hṛidayaṁ xipraṁ gāyatryā nayanāntare | Garbhasya sambhavo yaścha chaturdhā purushātmakaḥ | Brahmatejomayo 'vyaktaḥ śāśvato 'tha dhruvo 'vyayaḥ | na chendriyaguṇair yukto yuktas tejoguṇena cha | chandrāṁśu-vimala-prakhyo bhrājishṇur varṇa-saṁsthitaḥ | Netrābhyāṁ janayad deva ṛigvedaṁ yajushā saha | sāmavedañcha jihvāgrād atharvāṇañcha mūrddhatah | Jātamātrāstu te vedāh xetraṁ vindanti tattvataḥ | Tena vedatvam āpannā yasmād vindanti tatpadam | Te sṛijanti tadā vedā brahma pūrvaṁ sanātanam | Purushaṁ divyarūpābhaṁ svaiḥ svair bhāvair manobhavaiḥ.* "For the emancipation of the world, Brahmā, sunk in contemplation, issuing in a luminous form from the region of the moon, penetrated into the heart of Gāyatrī, entering between her eyes. From her there was then produced a quadruple being, lustrous as Brahmā, indistinct, and eternal, undecaying, devoid of bodily senses or qualities, distinguished by the attribute of brilliancy, pure as the rays of the moon, radiant, and embodied in letters. The god fashioned the Rig-veda, with the Yajush, from his eyes, the Sāma-veda from the tip of his tongue, and the Atharvan from his head. These Vedas, as soon as they are born, find a body (*xetra*). Hence they obtain their character of *Vedas*, because they *find* (*vindanti*) that abode. These Vedas then create the pre-existent eternal brahma (sacrifice or ceremonial), a being of celestial form, with their own mind-born qualities."

I extract another passage on the same subject from a later section of the same work, verses 12,425, ff. When the Supreme Being was intent on creating the universe, Hiranyagarbha, or Prajāpati, issued from his mouth, and was desired to divide himself,—a process which he was in great doubt how he should

effect. The text then proceeds:—*Iti chintayatas tasya om ity evotthitaḥ svaraḥ | sa bhumāv antarīxe cha nāke cha kṛitavān svanam | Tañchaivābhyasatas tasya manaḥ-sāramayam punaḥ | hṛidayād deva-devasya vashaṭkāraḥ samutthitaḥ | bhūmyantarīxa-nākānām bhūyaḥ svaratmakāḥ parāḥ | mahāsmṛitimayāḥ punyā mahāvyāhṛitayo 'bhavan | chhandasām pravarā devī chaturviṁśāxarā 'bhavat | Tatpadaṁ saṁsmaran divyam sāvitrīm akarot prabhuḥ | ṛik-sāmātharva-yajushaś chaturo bhagavān prabhuḥ | chakāra nikhilān vedān brahmayuktena karmaṇā.* "While he was thus reflecting, the sound *om* issued from him, and resounded throughout the earth, atmosphere, and sky. While the God of gods was again and again repeating this, the essence of the mind, the *vashaṭkāra* proceeded from his heart. Next, the sacred *vyāhritis* (*bhūr, bhuvaḥ, svar*) formed of the great *smriti*, the most excellent emblems of earth, atmosphere, and sky were produced. Then appeared the goddess, the most excellent of metres, with twenty-four syllables [the *gāyatrī*]. Reflecting on the divine text [beginning with] *tad*, the Lord formed the *sāvitrī*. He then produced all the Vedas, the Rik, Sāman, Atharvan, and Yajush, with their prayers and rites." (See also the passage from the Bhāg. Pur. xii. 6, 37, ff., which will be quoted in a following section.)

Mahābhārata.—The Mahābhārata in one passage speaks of the goddess Sarasvatī as the mother of the Vedas. Śānti P. verse 12,920:—*Vedānām mātaraṁ paśya matsthām devīṁ Sarasvatīm.* "Behold Sarasvatī, mother of the Vedas, abiding in me."

I will add here two passages, of a somewhat similar character, from the Rik and Atharva Sanhitās, though they ought, strictly speaking, to have been reserved for the next chapter.

Rig-veda.—In the 9th verse of the Purusha Sūkta (already quoted in Part First, pp. 7 and 8), the three Vedas are said to have been derived from the mystical victim Purusha. "From that universal sacrifice were produced the hymns called Rik and Sāman, the metres, and the Yajush."

Atharva-veda.—In regard to the origin of two of the Vedas,

the Atharva-veda says, xix. 54, 3 :—*Kālād ṛichaḥ samabhavan yajuḥ kālād ajāyata.* "From time the Rik verses sprang; the Yajush sprang from time."[6]

Manu.—According to the verses in Manu, xii. 49, 50, quoted in Part First of this work, p. 18, the Vedas, with the other beings and objects named along with them, constitute the *second* manifestation of the *sattva guṇa*, or pure principle; while Brahmā is placed in a higher rank, as one of the *first* manifestations of the same principle. The word Veda in this passage is explained by Kullūka of those "embodied deities, celebrated in the Itihāsas, who preside over the Vedas." (*Vedābhimāninyaścha devatā vigrahavatya itihāsa-prasiddāḥ.*)

Vishnu Purana.—At the end of Section 6 of the third book of the V. P. (p. 285 of Wilson's Trans.) we have the following assertion of the eternity of the Veda :—*Iti śākhāḥ prasaṇkhyātāḥ śākhābhedās tathaiva cha | karttāraśchaiva śākhānām bhedahetus tathoditaḥ | sarvamanvantareshveva śākhābhedāḥ samāḥ smṛitāḥ | Prājāpatyā śrutir nityā tadvikalpās tv ime dvija.* "Thus the Śākhās, their divisions, their authors, and the cause of the division have been declared. In all the manvantaras the divisions of the Śākhās are recorded to be the same. The *śruti* (Veda) derived from Prajāpati (Brahmā) is eternal: these, o Brahman, are only its modifications."

In another passage of the same book, Vishnu is identified with the Vedas. Vish. Pur. iii. 3, 19 ff. (Wilson, p. 274) :—*Sa ṛiṇgmayaḥ sāmamayaḥ sa chātmā sa yajurmayaḥ | ṛig-yajuḥ-sāmasārātmā sa evātmā śarīriṇām | sa bhidyate vedamayaḥ sa vedaṁ karoti bhedair bahubhiḥ saśākham | śākhāpraṇetā sa samastaśākhā jñānasvarūpo bhagavān anantaḥ.* "He is composed of the Rik, of the Sāman, of the Yajush; he is the soul. Consisting of the essence of the Rik, Yajush, and Sāman, he is the soul of

[6] The Vishṇu Purana, 1, 2, 13 (Wilson's Trans. p. 9), says :—*Tad eva sarvam evaitad vyaktāvyaktasvarūpavat | Tathā purusharūpeṇa kālarūpeṇa cha sthitam.* "This Brahma is all this universe, existing both as the indiscrete and the discrete; existing also in the form of *Purusha* and of *Kāla* (time)."

embodied spirits. Formed of the Veda, he is divided; he forms the Veda and its branches (*śākhās*) into many divisions. Framer of the Śākhās, he is also their entirety, the infinite lord, whose essence is knowledge."

SECT. III.—*Manu's conception of the dignity and authority of the Veda, with some statements of a different tenor from him and other writers.*

Manu employs the following honorific expressions in reference to the Vedas (xii. 94 ff.): — *Pitṛi-deva-manushyāṉāṁ vedaś chaxuḥ sanātanam | aśakyañchāprameyañcha veda-śāstram iti sthitiḥ || Yā veda-vāhyāḥ smṛitayo yāścha kāścha kudṛishṭayaḥ |*[7] *sarvās tā nishphalāḥ pretya tamonishṭhā hi tāḥ smṛitaḥ || Utpadyante chyavante cha yāny ato 'nyāni kānichit | Tāny arvāk-kālikatayā*[8] *nishphalāny anṛitāni cha || Chāturvarṇyaṁ trayo lokāś chatvāraś chāśramāḥ pṛithak | Bhūtam bhavad bhavishyañcha sarvaṁ vedāt prasiddhyati || śabdaḥ sparśaścha rūpañcha raso gandhaścha pañchamaḥ | vedād eva prasiddhyanti prasūti-guṇa-karmataḥ || Bibhartti*[9] *sarva-bhūtāni veda-śāstraṁ sanātanam | Tasmād etat param manye yaj jantor asya sādhanam || Saināpatyañcha rājyañcha daṇḍa-netṛitvam eva cha | sarva-lokādhipatyañcha veda-śāstra-vid arhati || Yathā jāta-balo vahnir dahyaty ārdrān api drumān | tathā dahati vedajñaḥ karmajaṁ dosham ātmanaḥ | veda-śāstrārtha-tattvajño yatra tatrāśrame vasan | Ihaiva loke tishṭhan sa brahmabhūyāya kalpate.* "The Veda is the eternal eye of the patriarchs, of gods, and of men; it is beyond human power and comprehension;

[7] *Dṛishṭārtha-vākyāni 'chaityavandanāt svargo bhavati' ity ādīni yāni cha asattarka-mūlāni devatā-'pūrvādi-nirākaraṇātmakāni veda-viruddhāni chārvāka-darśanāni*:—"That is, deductions from experience of the visible world; such doctrines as that 'heaven is attained by obeisance to a chaitya,' and similar Chārvāka tenets founded on false reasonings, contradicting the existence of the gods, and the efficacy of religious rites, and contrary to the Vedas."—Kullūka.

[8] *Idānīntanatvāt.* "From their modernness."—Kullūka.

[9] *Havir agnau hūyate, so 'agnir ādityam upasarpati, tat sūryo raśmibhir varshati, tenānnam bhavati, atheha bhūtānām utpatti-sthitiścheti havir jāyate iti brāhmaṇam.* "The oblation is cast into the fire; fire reaches the sun; the sun causes rain by his rays; thence food is produced; thus the oblation becomes the cause of the generation and maintenance of creatures; so says a Brahmana."—Kullūka.

this is a certain conclusion. Whatever traditions are apart from the Veda, and all heretical views, are fruitless in the next world, for they are declared to be founded on darkness. All other [books] external to the Veda, which arise and pass away, are worthless and false from their recentness of date. The system of the four castes, the three worlds, the four states of life, all that has been, now is, or shall be, is made manifest by the Veda. The objects of touch and taste, sound, form, and odour, as the fifth, are made known by the Veda, together with their products, qualities, and the actions they occasion. The eternal Veda supports all beings: hence I regard it as the principal instrument of well-being to this creature, man. Command of armies, royal authority, the administration of criminal justice, and the sovereignty of all worlds, he alone deserves who knows the Veda. As fire, when it has acquired force, burns up even green trees, so he who knows the Veda consumes the taint of his soul which has been contracted from works. He who comprehends the essential meaning of the Veda, in whatever order of life he may be, is prepared for absorption into Brahma, even while abiding in this lower world."

The following are some further miscellaneous passages of the same tenor, scattered throughout the Institutes (Manu ii. 10 ff.): —*Śrutistu vedo vijñeyo dharma-śāstrantu vai smritiḥ | te sarvārtheshv amīmāṁsye tābhyāṁ dharmo hi nirbabhau* | 11. *Yo 'vamanyeta te mūle hetu-śāstrāśrayād dvijaḥ | sa sādhubhir vahishkāryyo nāstiko vedanindakaḥ* | 13. . . . *Dharmaṁ jijñāsamānānām pramāṇam paramaṁ śrutiḥ.* "By śruti is meant the Veda, and by smriti the institutes of law: the contents of these are not to be questioned by reason, since from them [a knowledge of] duty has shone forth. The Brahman who, relying on rationalistic treatises,[10] shall contemn these two primary sources

[10] This, however, must be read in conjunction with the precept in xii. 106, which declares:—*ārshaṁ dharmopadeśañcha veda-śāstrāvirodhinā | yas tarkenānusandhatte sa dharmaṁ veda nāparaḥ.* "He, and he only is acquainted with duty, who investigates the injunctions of the rishis, and the precepts of the smriti, by reasonings which do not contradict the Veda."

of knowledge, must be excommunicated by the virtuous as a sceptic and reviler of the Vedas. . . . 13. To those who are seeking a knowledge of duty, the *śruti* is the supreme authority."

In the following passage, the necessity of a knowledge of Brahma is asserted, though the practice of ritual observances is also inculcated (vi. 82, ff.): — *Dhyānikaṁ sarvam evaitad yad etad abhiśabditam | na hy anadhyātma-vit kaśchit kriyāphalam upāśnute | adhiyajñam brahma japed ādhidaivikam eva cha | ādhyatmikañcha satataṁ vedāntābhihitañcha yat | Idaṁ śaraṇam ajñānām idam eva vijānatām | idam anvichchhatāṁ svargam idam ānantyam ichchhatām.* "All this which has been now declared is dependant on devout meditation: no one who is ignorant of the supreme spirit can reap the fruit of ceremonial acts. Let a man repeat texts relating to sacrifice, texts relating to deities, texts relating to the supreme spirit, and whatever is declared in the Vedānta. This [Veda] is the refuge of the ignorant, as well as of the understanding; it is the refuge of those who are seeking after paradise, as well as of those who are desiring infinity."

The following text breathes a moral spirit, by representing purity of life as essential to the reception of benefit from religious observances (ii. 97):— *Vedās tyāgaścha yajñāścha niyamāścha tapāṁsi cha | na vipradushṭa-bhāvasya siddhiṁ gachhanti karchichit.* "The Vedas, almsgiving, sacrifices, observances, austerities, are ineffectual to a man of depraved disposition."

The doctrine which may be drawn from the following lines does not seem so favourable to morality (xi. 261, ff.):—*Hatvā lokān apīmāṁ s trīn aśnann api yatastataḥ | Rigvedaṁ dhārayan vipro nainaḥ prāpnoti kiñchana | Ṛiksaṁhitāṁ trir abhyasya yajushāṁ vā samāhitaḥ | sāmnāṁ vā sarahasyānāṁ sarvapāpaiḥ pramuchyate | yathā mahā-hradam prāpya xiptam loshṭaṁ vinaśyati | tathā duścharitaṁ sarvaṁ vede trivṛiti majjati.* "A Brahman who should destroy these three worlds, and eat food received from any quarter whatever, would incur no guilt if he retained in his memory the [whole] Rig-veda. Repeating thrice

with intent mind the sanhitā of the Rik, or the Yajush, or the Sāman, with the Upanishads, he is freed from all his sins. Just as a clod thrown into a great lake is dissolved when it touches the water, so does all sin sink in the triple Veda."

Considering the sacredness ascribed in the preceding passages to all the Vedas, the epithet applied to the Sāma-veda in the second of the following verses is remarkable (Manu iv. 123, ff.): *Sāmadhvanāv ṛigyajushī nādhīyīta kadāchana | vedasyādhītya vā'py antam āraṉyakam adhītya cha | Ṛigvedo devadaivatyo yajurvedastu mānushaḥ | Sāmavedaḥ smṛitaḥ pitryas tasmāt tasyāśuchir dhvaniḥ.* "Let no one read the Rik or the Yajush while the Sāman is sounding in his ears, or after he has read the conclusion of the Veda (*i.e.* the Vedānta) or an Āranyaka. The Rig-veda has the gods for its deities, the Yajur-veda has men for its objects, the Sāma-veda has the pitris for its divinities, wherefore its sound is impure."

The scholiast Kullūka, however, will not allow that the Sāma-veda can be "really impure." "It has," he says, "only a semblance of impurity" (*tasmāt tasya aśuchir iva dhvaniḥ | na tv aśuchir eva*). In this remark he evinces the tendency, incident to many systematic theologians, to ignore all those features of the sacred text on which they are commenting which are at variance with their theories regarding its absolute perfection. As it was the opinion of his age that the Veda was eternal and divine, it was, he considered, impossible that impurity or any species of fault could be predicated of any of its parts; and every expression, even of the highest authorities, which contradicted this opinion, had to be explained away. I am not in a position to state how this notion of impurity came to be attached to the Sāma-veda. The passage perhaps proceeded from the adherents of some particular Vedic school adverse to the Sāma-veda; but its substance being found recorded in some earlier work, it was deemed of sufficient authority to find a place in the miscellaneous collection of precepts,—gathered no doubt from different quarters, and perhaps not always strictly con-

sistent with each other,—which make up the Manava-dharma-śāstra.

Vishnu Purana.—The following passage from the Vishnu Purana, at the close, ascribes the same character of impurity to the Sāma-veda, though on different grounds, Vish. Pur. ii. 11, 5 (Wilson, p. 235):—*Yā tu śaktiḥ parā Vishṇor ṛig-yajuḥ-sāma-sañjñitā | saishā trayī tapaty aṁho jagataścha hinasti yat | saiva Vishṇuḥ sthitaḥ sthityāṁ jagataḥ pālanodyataḥ | ṛig-yajuḥ-sāma-bhūto 'ntaḥ savitur dvija tishṭhati | māsi māsi ravir yo yas tatra tatra hi sā parā | trayīmayī Vishṇu-śaktir avasthānaṁ karoti vai | Richas tapanti pūrvāhne madhyāhne 'tha yajūṁshy atha | vṛihad-rathantarādīni sāmāny ahnaḥ xaye ravau | aṇgam eshā trayī Vishṇor ṛig-yajuḥ-sāma-sañjñitā | Vishṇu-śaktir avasthānam māsāditye karoti sā | na kevalaṁ ravau śaktir vaishṇavī sā trayīmayī | Brahmā 'tha Purusho Rudras trayam etat trayīmayam | sargādāv ṛiṇgmayo Brahmā sthitau Vishṇur yajurmayaḥ | Rudraḥ sāmamayo 'ntāya tasmāt tasyāśuchir dhvaniḥ.* "The supreme energy of Vishnu, called the Rik, Yajush, and Sāman—this triad burns up sin and all things injurious to the world. During the continuance of the world, this triad exists as Vishnu, who is occupied in the preservation of the universe, and in the form of the Rik, Yajush, and Sāman, abides within the sun. That supreme energy of Vishnu, consisting of the triple Veda, dwells in the particular form of the sun, which presides over each month. The Rik verses shine in the morning sun, the Yajush verses in his meridian beams, and the Vrihad rathantara and other Sāma verses in his declining rays. This triple Veda is the body of Vishnu, and this his energy abides in the monthly sun. But this energy of Vishnu, formed of the triple Veda, does not reside in the sun alone; Brahmā, Purusha (Vishnu), and Rudra also constitute a triad formed of the triple Veda. At the creation, Brahmā is formed of the Rig-veda; during the continuance of the universe, Vishnu is composed of the Yajur-veda; and for the destruction of the worlds, Rudra is made up of the Sāma-veda; hence the sound of this Veda is impure."

Vayu Purana.—Other passages also may be found in works not reputed to be heretical, in which the Vedas, or particular parts of them, are not spoken of with the same degree of respect as they are by Manu. Thus the Vāyu Purana gives precedence to the Puranas over the Vedas in the order of creation (i. 56[11]): —*Prathamaṁ sarva-śāstrāṇāṁ Purāṇaṁ Brahmaṇā smṛitam | anantarañcha vaktrebhyo vedās tasya vinissṛitāḥ.* "First of all the Sastras, the Purana was uttered by Brahmā. Subsequently the Vedas issued from his mouths."

The same Purana says further on in the same section (p. 50 of Dr. Aufrecht's Catalogue):—*Yo vidyāch chaturo vedān sāṅgopanishado dvijaḥ | na chet purāṇaṁ saṁvidyād naiva sa syād vichakṣaṇaḥ | Itihāsa-purāṇābhyāṁ vedān samupabṛiṁhayet | vibhety alpaśrutād vedo mām ayaṁ praharishyati.* "He who knows the four Vedas, with their supplements and Upanishads, is not really learned, unless he know also the Puranas. Let a man, therefore, complete the Vedas by adding the Itihasas and Puranas. The Veda is afraid of a man of little learning, lest he should treat it injuriously."

Brahma-vaivartta Purana.—The Brahma-vaivartta Purana asserts in a yet more audacious manner its own superiority to the Veda (i. 48 ff.):—*Bhavagan yat tvayā pṛishṭaṁ jñātaṁ sarvam abhīpsitam | sārabhūtaṁ purāṇeshu Brahma-vaivarttam uttamam | Purāṇopapurāṇānāṁ vedānām bhrama-bhañjanam.* "That about which, venerable sage, you have inquired, is all known by me, the essence of the Puranas, the pre-eminent Brahma-vaivartta, which refutes the errors of the Puranas and Upapuranas, and of the Vedas." (Aufrecht's Cat. p. 21.)

In the following passage also, from the commencement of the Muṇḍaka Upanishad, the Vedic hymns (though a divine origin, would no doubt be allowed to them[12]) are at all events depre-

[11] P. 48 of Dr. Aufrecht's Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

[12] In fact the following verses (4 and 6) occur in the second chapter of the same Mund. Up.:—4. *Agnir mūrddhā chaxushī chandrasūryyau diśaḥ śrotre vāg vivṛitāścha vedāḥ | vāyuḥ prāṇo hṛidayaṁ viśvam asya padbhyām pṛithivī hy esha sarva-*

ciated, by being classed among other works as part of the inferior science, in contrast to the Brahma-vidyā or knowledge of Brahma, the highest of all knowledge, which is expressly ascribed to Brahmā as its author:—1. *Brahmā devānām prathamaḥ sambabhūva viśvasya karttā bhuvanasya goptā | sa brahmavidyāṁ sarvavidyāpratiṣṭhām Atharvāya jyeshṭhaputrāya prāha | 2. Atharvaṇe yām pravadeta Brahmā Atharvā tām purovāch' Āṇgire brahma-vidyām | sa Bhāradvājāya Satyavāhāya prāha Bhāradvājo 'ngirase parāvarām | 3. Śaunako ha vai Mahāśālo 'ngirasaṁ vidhivad upapannaḥ prapachcha | kasmin nu bhagavo viṇjāte sarvam idaṁ viṇjātam bhavatīti | 4. Tasmai sa hovācha | dve vidye veditavye iti ha sma yad brahmavido vadanti parā chaivāpara cha | 5. Tatrāparā ṛigvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo 'tharvavedaḥ śixā kalpo vyākaraṇaṁ niruktaṁ chhando jyotisham iti | atha parā yayā tad axaram adhigamyate.* "Brahmā was produced the first among the gods, maker of the universe, preserver of the world. He revealed to his eldest son Atharvan, the science of Brahmā, the support of all knowledge. 2. Atharvan of old declared to Angis this science, which Brahmā had unfolded to him; and Angis, in turn, explained it to Satyavāha, descendant of Bharadvāja, who delivered this traditional lore [or the higher and lower science] to Angiras. 3. Śaunaka, the great householder, approaching Angiras in due form, inquired, 'What is that, O venerable sage, through the knowledge of which all this [universe] becomes known?' 4. [Angiras] answered, 'Two sciences are to be known—this is what the sages acquainted with Brahma declare—the superior and the inferior. 5. The inferior [consists of] the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Atharva-veda, accentuation, ritual,

bhūtāntarātmā | . . . 6. Tasmād ṛichaḥ sāma yajūṁshi dīxā yajñāścha sarve kratavo daxiṇāścha | saṁvatsaraṁcha yajamānaścha lokāḥ somo yatra pavate yatra sūryaḥ. "Agni is his [Brahma's] head, the sun and moon are his eyes, the four points of the compass are his ears, the uttered Vedas are his voice, the air is his breath, the universe is his heart, the earth issued from his feet: he is the inner soul of all creatures. . . . From him came the Rik verses, the Sāman, the Yajush verses, initiatory rites, all oblations, sacrifices, and gifts, the year, the sacrificer, and the worlds where the moon and sun purify."

grammar, commentary, prosody, and astronomy. The superior science is that by which the imperishable is comprehended.'"

It is to be remarked that in this passage (verse 5) as in that already quoted above (p. 7) from the Vṛihad Āryanyaka Upanishad, the most essential parts of the Vedas, the sanhitās, are classed in the same category with the Kalpa or ceremonial institutes, and other works, from which they are separated by a broad line of demarcation in the works of later writers.

The following passage from the Kaṭha Upanishad (ii. 23) is of a somewhat similar tenor (p. 107 of Roër's ed. and p. 106 of Eng. trans.):—*Nāyam ātmā pravachanena labhyo na medhayā na bahunā śrutena | yam evaisha vṛinute tena labhyas tasyaisha ātmā vṛinute tanūṁ svām.* "This soul is not to be attained by tradition, nor by understanding, nor by much scripture. He is attainable by him whom he chooses. The soul chooses that man's body as his own."

The scholiast interprets thus the first part of this text:—*Yadyapi durvijñeyo 'yam ātmā tathāpy upāyena suvijñeya eva ity āha nāyam ātmā pravachanena aneka-veda-svīkaraṇena labhyo jñeyo nāpi medhayā granthārtha-dhāraṇā-śaktyā na bahunā śrutena kevalena | kena tarhi labhya ity uchyate.* "Although this soul is difficult to know, still it may easily be known by the use of proper means. This is what [the author] proceeds to say. This soul is not to be attained, known, by tradition, by the acknowledgment of many Vedas; nor by understanding, by the power of recollecting the contents of books; nor by much scripture alone. By what, then, is it to be attained? This he declares."

It is not necessary to follow the scholiast into the Vedantic explanation of the rest of the passage.[13]

[13] See Prof. Müller's Anc. Sans. Lit. 1st ed. p. 320, and p. 109.

SECT. IV.—*Division of the Vedas, according to the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Bhāgavata Puranas, and the Mahābhārata.*

The Vishnu Purana gives the following account of the division of the Veda, described as having been originally but one, into four parts, iii. 2, 18 (see Wilson's Trans. p. 270):—*Kṛite yuge paraṁ jñānam Kapilādi-svarūpa-dhṛik | dadāti sarva-bhūtānāṁ sarva-bhūtahite rataḥ | chakravartti-svarūpeṇa Tretāyām api sa prabhuḥ | Dushṭānāṁ nigrahaṁ kurvan paripāti jagattrayam | Vedam ekaṁ chaturbhedaṁ kṛitvā śākhā-śatair vibhuḥ | karoti bahulam bhūyo Vedavyāsa-svarūpa-dhṛik | vedāṁs tu dvāpare vyasya, etc.* "In the Krita age, Vishnu, devoted to the welfare of all creatures, assumes the form of Kapila and others to confer upon them the highest knowledge. In the Tretā age, the Supreme Lord, in the form of a universal potentate, represses the violence of the wicked, and protects the three worlds. Assuming the form of Vyāsa, the all-pervading Being repeatedly divides the single Veda into four parts, and multiplies it by distributing it into hundreds of śākhās. Having thus divided the Vedas in the Dvāpara age," etc.

This is repeated more at length in the following section (Vish. Pur. iii. 3, 4 ff.):— *Veda-drumasya Maitreya śākhābhedaiḥ sahasraśaḥ | na śakyo vistaro vaktuṁ saṁxepeṇa sṛiṇushva tam | Dvāpare Dvāpare Vishṇur Vyāsarūpī mahāmune | Vedam ekam sa bahudhā kurute jagato hitaḥ | vīryaṁ tejo balañchālpam manushyāṇām avexya vai | hitāya sarvabhūtānāṁ veda-bhedān karoti saḥ | yayā sa kurute tanvā vedam ekaṁ pṛithak prabhuḥ | Vedavyāsābhidhānā tu sā mūrttir Madhuvidvishaḥ | . . . Ashṭāviṁśati-kṛitvo vai vedā vyastā maharshibhiḥ | Vaivasvate 'ntare tasmin Dvāpareshu punaḥ punaḥ.* "It is not possible, Maitreya, to describe in detail the tree of the Vedas with its thousand branches (*śākhās*); but listen to a summary. A friend to the world, Vishnu, in the form of Vyāsa, divides the single Veda into many parts. He does so for the good of all creatures, because he perceives the vigour, energy, and strength of men to

be now but limited. Vedavyāsa, in whose person he performs this division, is an impersonation of the enemy of Madhu (Vishnu). . . . Eight-and-twenty times in the Dvāpara ages of this Vaivasvata manvantara[14] have the Vedas been divided by great sages." These sages are then enumerated, and Krishna Dvaipayana[15] is the twenty-eighth.

The subject is resumed at the beginning of the next section (Vish. Pur. iii. 4, 1 ff.):—*Ādyo vedaś chatushpādaḥ śata-sāhasra-sammitaḥ | Tato daśa-guṇaḥ kṛitsno yajño 'yaṁ sarva-kāma-dhuk | Tato 'tra matsuto Vyāso 'shṭāviṁśatitame 'ntare | vedam ekam chatushpādaṁ chaturdhā vyabhajat prabhuḥ | yathā tu tena vai vyastā Vedavyāsena dhīmatā | Vedās tathā samastais tair vyastā Vyāsais tathā mayā | tad anenaiva vedānāṁ śākhā-bhedān dvijottama | chaturyugeshu rachitān samasteshv avadhāraya | Krishna-dvaipāyanaṁ Vyāsam viddhi Nārāyaṇam prabhum | ko 'nyo hi bhuvi Maitreya Mahābhārata-kṛid bhavet | Tena vyastā yathā Vedā matputreṇa mahātmanā | Dvāpare hy atra Maitreya tad me śṛiṇu yathārthataḥ | Brahmaṇā chodito Vyāso vedān vyastum prachakrame | Atha śishyān sa jagrāha chaturo veda-pāragān | Ṛigveda-śrāvakam Pailaṁ jagrāha sa mahāmuniḥ | Vaiśampāyana-nāmānaṁ Yajurvedasya chāgrahīt | Jaiminiṁ sāma-vedasya tathaivātharvaveda-vit | Sumantus tasya śishyo 'bhūd Vedavyāsasya dhīmataḥ | Romaharshaṇa-nāmānam mahābuddhim mahāmunim | Sūtaṁ jagrāha śishyaṁ sa itihāsa-purāṇayoḥ.* "The original Veda, four-footed [or in four quarters] consisted of a hundred thousand verses. From it arose the entire system of sacrifice, of ten descriptions [or of tenfold

[14] For an account of the Manvantaras, see the First Part of this work, pp. 18, 19.

[15] Lassen (Ind. Ant. i. 629, note) remarks:—"Vyasa signifies *arrangement*, and this signification had still retained its place in the recollection of the ancient recorders of the legend, who have formed from his name an irregular perfect, viz. *vivyāsa*." Lassen refers to two passages of the Mahābhārata in which the name is explained, viz. (i. 2417), *Vivyāsa vedān yasmāt sa tasmād Vyāsa iti smṛitaḥ.* "He is called Vyasa because he divided the Veda." And (i. 4236) *Yo vyasya Vedāṁś chaturas tapasā bhagavān ṛishiḥ | Loke vyāsatvam āpede kārshṇyat kṛishṇatvam eva cha.* "The divine sage (Krishna Dvaipayana Vyasa) who, through intense devotion, divided the four Vedas, and so obtained in the world the title of Vyasa, and from his blackness, the name of Krishna."

efficacy?], and yielding all the objects of desire. Subsequently, in the twenty-eighth period, my son (it is Parāśara who is the speaker), the mighty Vyāsa divided into four parts the one four-quartered Veda. In the same way as the Vedas were divided by the wise Vyāsa, so had they been divided by all the [preceding] Vyāsas, including myself. And know that the sākhā divisions [formed] by him [were the same as those] formed in all the periods of four yugas. Learn, too, that Krishna Dvaipāyana Vyāsa was the lord Nārāyana, for who else on earth could have composed the Mahābhārata? Hear now correctly how the Vedas were divided by him, my great-souled son, in this Dvāpara age. When, commanded by Brahmā, Vyāsa undertook to divide the Vedas, he took four disciples who had read through those books. The great muni took Paila as teacher of the Rik, Vaiśampāyana of the Yajush, and Jaimini of the Sāman, while Sumantu, skilled in the Atharvaveda, was also his disciple. He took, too, as his pupil for the Itihāsas and Puranas the great and intelligent muni, Sūta, called Romaharshana."

Vāyu Purana.—In the same way, and partly in the same words, the Vāyu Purana (Section lx.) represents the Vedas to have been divided in the Dvāpara age. It first describes how this was done by Manu in the Svāyambhuva, or first Manvantara, and then recounts how Vyāsa performed the same task in the existing seventh, or Vaivasvata Manvantara; and, no doubt, also in the Dvāpara age, though this is not expressly stated in regard to Vyāsa.

The following is an extract from this passage (as given in Dr. Aufrecht's Catalogue, p. 54):—*Dvāpare tu purāvṛitte Manoḥ svāyambhuve 'ntare | Brahmā Manum uvāchedam vedaṁ vyasya mahāmate | Parivṛittaṁ yugaṁ tāta svalpavīryā dvijātayaḥ | saṁvṛittā yugadoshena sarvañchaiva yathākramam | bhrashṭamānaṁ yāgavaśād alpaśishṭaṁ hi dṛiśyate | Daśa-sāhasra-bhāgena hy avaśishṭam kṛitād idam | vīryaṁ tejo balañchālpaṁ sarvañchaiva praṇaśyati | vede vedā hi kāryyāḥ syur mā bhūd veda-vināśanam | vede nāśam anuprāpte yajño nāśaṁ gamishyati |*

yajñe nashṭe deva-nāśas tataḥ sarvam praṇaśyati | Ādyo vedaś chatushpādo śata-sāhasra-sammitaḥ | Punar dasa-guṇaḥ kṛitsno yajño vai sarva-kāma-dhuk | Evam uktas tathety uktvā Manur loka-hite rataḥ | vedam ekam chatush-pādaṁ chaturdhā vyabhajat prabhuḥ | Brahmaṇo vachanāt tāta lokānāṁ hita-kāmyayā | tad aham varttamānena yushmākam veda-kalpanam | manvantareṇa vaxyāmi vyatītānām prakalpanam | pratyaxena paroxaṁ vai tad nibodhata sattamāḥ | Asmin yuge kṛito Vyāsaḥ pārāśaryaḥ parantapaḥ | Dvaipāyana iti khyāto Vishṇor aṁśaḥ prakīrttitaḥ | Brahmaṇā choditaḥ so 'smin vedaṁ vyastum prachakrame | Atha śishyān sa jagrāha chaturo vedakāraṇāt | Jaiminiñcha Sumantuñcha Vaiśampāyanam eva cha | Pailaṁ teshāṁ chaturthantu pañchamaṁ Lomaharshaṇam. "In the former Dvāpara of the Svāyambhuva Manvantara, Brahmā said to Manu, 'Divide the Veda, O sage. The age is changed; through its baneful influence the Brahmans have become feeble, and from the same cause everything has been gradually corrupted, so that little [good] is seen remaining. Only a ten-thousandth part is now left of the vigour, fire, and energy of the Kṛita age, and everything declines. Vedas must be made out of the one Veda, lest the Veda be destroyed. The destruction of the Veda would involve the destruction of sacrifice; that again would occasion the annihilation of the gods, and then everything would go to ruin. The primeval Veda was four-footed [or consisted of four quarters], and extended to one hundred thousand verses, while sacrifice was of ten sorts [or tenfold efficacy], and yielded every object of desire.' Being thus addressed, Manu, the lord, devoted to the good of the world, replied, 'Be it so,' and in conformity with the command of Brahmā, divided the one four-quartered Veda into four parts.[16] I shall, therefore, narrate to you the division of the Veda in the existing Manvantara; from which present division you, virtuous sages, can understand those remote

[16] The Maha Bhar. Santip. v. 13,678, says the Vedas were divided in the Svayambhuva Manvantara by Apāntaratamas, son of Sarasvatī. *Tena bhinnās tadā vedā manoḥ svāyambhuvo 'ntare.*

arrangements of the same kind which were made in past Manvantaras. In this Yuga, the victorious son of Parāśara, who is called Dvaipāyana, and is celebrated as a portion of Vishnu, has been made the Vyāsa. In this [Yuga?], he, being commanded by Brahmā, began to divide the Vedas. For this purpose, he took four pupils, Jaimini, Sumantu, Vaiśampāyana, and Paila, and, as a fifth, Lomaharshana" [for the Puranas and Itihāsas, etc.]

Bhāgavata Purana.—It is in its Third Book, where the different Manvantaras are described, that the Vishnu Purana gives an account of the division of the Vedas. In the book of the Bhāgavata Purana, where the Manvantaras are enumerated, there is no corresponding allusion to the division of the Vedas. Towards the close of the Purana, however, in the sixth section of the twelfth book (verses 37 ff.) there is to be found what Prof. Wilson (Vish. Pur. Pref. p. xxvii.) calls "a rather awkwardly introduced description of the arrangement of the Vedas and Puranas by Vyāsa," which is no doubt brought in here, to supply the omission which the original author, or some subsequent editor, had discovered to exist in the earlier part of the work.

The passage (as given in the Bombay lithographed edition) is as follows:—*Sūta uvācha | samāhitātmano brahman Brahmaṇaḥ parameshṭhinaḥ | hṛid-ākāśād abhūd nādo vṛittirodhād vibhāvyate | yad-upāsanayā brahman yogino malam ātmanaḥ | dravya-kriyā-kārakākhyaṁ dhūtva yānty apunurbhavam | Tato 'bhūt tivṛid oṁkāro yo 'vyakta-prabhavaḥ svarāṭ | yat talliṅgam Bhagavato brahmaṇaḥ paramātmanaḥ | sṛiṇoti ya imaṁ sphoṭaṁ supta-śrotre cha śūnyadṛik | yena vāg vyajate yasya vyaktir ākāśe ātmanaḥ | svadhāmno brahmaṇaḥ sākṣād vāchakaḥ paramātmanaḥ | sa-sarva-mantropanishad-veda-vījaṁ sanātanam | tasya hyāsaṁs trayo varṇā a-kārādyā Bhṛigūdvaha | dhāryante yais trayo bhāvā guṇā nāmārtha-vṛittayaḥ | tato 'kṣara-samāmnāyam asṛijad bhagavān ajaḥ | Antasthoshma-svara-sparśa-hrasva-dīrghādi-lakṣaṇam | tenāsau chaturo vedāṁs chāturbhir vadanair vibhuḥ | sa-vyāhṛitikān soṁkārāṁś chāturhotra-vivakṣayā | putrān adhyā-*

payat tāṁstu brahmarshīn brahma-kovidān | te tu dharmopadeshṭāraḥ svaputrebhyaḥ samādiśan | te paramparayā prāptās tattachchhishyair dhṛita-vrataiḥ | chaturyugeshv atha vyastā dvāparādau maharshibhiḥ | xīṇāyushaḥ xīṇasattvān durmedhān vīxya kālataḥ | vedān brahmarshayo vyasyan (sic) hṛidisthāchchyuta-noditāḥ | Asminn apy antare brahman bhagavān loka-bhāvanaḥ | brahmeśādyair lokapālair yāchito dharma-guptaye | Parāśarāt Satyavatyām aṁśāṁśa-kalayā vibhuḥ | avatīrṇo mahābhāga vedaṁ chakre chaturvidham | ṛig-atharva-yajuḥ-sāmnāṁ rāśīn uddhṛitya vargaśaḥ | chatasraḥ saṁhitās chakre mantrair maṇiganā iva | tāsāṁ sa chaturaḥ śishyān upāhūya mahāmatiḥ | Ekaikāṁ saṁhitāṁ brahman ekaikasmai dadau vibhuḥ | Pailāya saṁhitām ādyām bahvṛichākhyām uvācha ha | Vaiśampāyanasañjñāya nigad ākhyaṁ yajur-gaṇam | sāmnāṁ Jaiminaye prāha tathā chhandoga-saṁhitām | Atharvāṅgirasīṁ nāma sva-śishāya Sumantave. "Sūta speaks: 'From the sky of the supreme Brahma's heart, when he was plunged in meditation, there issued a sound, which is perceived by the devout when they close their organs of sense. By adoring this sound, devotees destroy the soul's threefold taint, extrinsic, inherent, and superhuman,[17] and become exempt from future birth. From this sound sprang the triple *oṁkāra*, self-resplendent, unperceived in its production, the emblem of the divine Brahma, the supreme spirit. He (the supreme spirit) hears this sound (*sphoṭa*), though his ears be closed and his senses inactive,—(this *sphoṭa* or *oṁkāra ?*) through which speech is revealed, and of which a manifestation is made in the firmament of the soul.[18] This [*oṁkāra*] is the sensible

[17] *Dravya-kriyā-kāraka*, which the scholiast interprets as answering to *adhibhūta*, *adhyātma*, and *adhidaiva*. See the explanation of these terms in Wilson's Sānkhya-kārikā, pp. 2 and 9.

[18] I quote the scholiast's explanation of this obscure verse:—*Ko 'sau paramātmā tam āha 'śṛiṇoti' iti | imam sphoṭam avyaktam oṁkāram | nanu jīva evo taṁ śṛiṇotu | na ity āha | supta-śrotre karṇa-pidhānādinā avṛittike 'pi śrotre sati | jīvastu karaṇādhīnatvād na tadā śrota | tadupalabdhistu tasya paramātma-dvārikā eva iti bhāvaḥ | Iśvarastu naivam | yataḥ śūnya-dṛik śūnye 'pi indriya-varge dṛik jñānaṁ yasya | tathā hi supto yadā śabdaṁ śrutvā prabuddhyate na tadā jīvaḥ śrotā līnendriyatvāt | ato yas tadā śabdaṁ śrutvā jivam prabodhayati sa yathā paramātmā*

exponent of Brahma, the self-sustained, the supreme spirit; and it is the eternal seed of the Vedas, including all the Mantras and Upanishads. In this [*oṁkāra*] there were, o descendant of Bhrigu, three letters, A and the rest, by which the three conditions, viz. the [three] qualities, the [three] names, the [three] objects, the [three] states[19] are maintained. From these three letters the divine and unborn being created the various letters of the alphabet, distinguished as inner (*y, r, l, v*), *ushmas* (*ś, sh, s, h*), vowels, long and short, and consonants. With this [alphabet] the omnipresent Being, desiring to reveal the functions of the four classes of priests, [created] from his four mouths the four Vedas with the three sacred syllables (*vyāhṛitis*) and the *oṁkāra*. These he taught to his sons, the brahmarshis, skilled in sacred lore; and these teachers of duty, in turn declared them to *their* sons. The Vedas were thus received by each succeeding generation of devout pupils throughout the four yugas, from their predecessors, and were divided by great sages at the beginning of the Dvāpara.[20] The Brahmarshis, impelled by Achyuta, who resided in their hearts, divided the Vedas, because they perceived that men had declined in age, in virtue, and in understanding. In this Manvantara also,[21] the divine and omnipresent Being, the author of the

eva tadvat ko 'sāv oṁkāras taṁ viśinashṭi sārdhena yena vāg bṛihatī vyajyate yasya cha hṛidayākāśe ātmanaḥ sakāśād vyaktir abhivyaktiḥ. The word *sphoṭa* will be explained below, in Section VII.

[19] These the scholiast explains thus:—*Guṇāḥ sattvādayaḥ | nāmāni ṛig-yajuḥ-sāmāni | arthā bhūr-bhuvaḥ-svar-lokāḥ | vṛittayo jāgrad-ādyāḥ.*

[20] *Dvāparādau* can only mean the "beginning of the Dvāpara;" but the scholiast undertakes by the following process of reasoning to show that it means the *end* of that yuga. *Dvāparādau dvāparam ādir yasya tad-antyāṁśa-lakṣaṇasya kālasya | tasmin dvāparānte veda-vibhāga-prasiddheḥ Śantanu-samakāla-Vyāsāvatāra-prasiddheś-cha | vyastā vibhaktāḥ.* "Dvāparādau means the period of which the dvāpara was the beginning, *i.e.* the time distinguished as the concluding portion of that yuga; since it is notorious that the Vedas were divided at the end of the Dvāpara, and that the incarnation of Vyāsa was contemporaneous with S'antanu. Vyastāḥ=vibhaktāḥ, divided."

[21] From this it appears that hitherto the account had not referred to the present Manvantara. The scholiast remarks:—*Evaṁ sāmānyato veda-vibhāga-kramam uktvā vaivasvata-manvantare viśeshato nirūpayitum āha.* "Having thus [in the pre-

universe, being supplicated by Brahmeśa and the other guardians of the world, to maintain righteousness, became partially incarnate as the son of Parāśara and Satyavatī, and divided the Veda into four parts. Selecting aggregates of Rik, Atharva, Yajush, and Sāma verses, and arranging them in sections (*vargas*), he formed four *sanhitās* (collections) of the hymns, as gems [of the same description are gathered together in separate heaps]. Having summoned four disciples, the sage gave to each of them one of these sanhitās. To Paila he declared the first sanhitā, called that of the Bahvṛichas; to Vaiśampāyana the assemblage of Yajush verses, called Nigada; to Jaimini the Chhandoga collection of Sāma verses; and to his pupil, Sumantu, the Atharvangirasī."

The Bhāgavata Purana, however, is not consistent in the account which it gives of the division of the Vedas. In a passage already quoted in the First Part of this work, p. 48, it speaks of that division as having been the work of the monarch Purūravas, and as having taken place in the beginning of the Tretā age. From the importance of this text I will extract it here again at greater length.

The celestial nymph Ūrvaśī, the Purana tells us, had been doomed, in consequence of a curse, to take up her abode upon earth. She there fell in love with King Purūravas, the report of whose manly beauty had touched her heart, even before she had been banished from paradise. After spending many happy days in the society of her lover, she forsook him in consequence of his having infringed one of the conditions of their cohabitation, and Purūravas was in consequence rendered very miserable. He at length, however, obtained a renewal of their intercourse, and she finally recommended him to worship the Gandharvas, who would then re-unite her to him indissolubly.

The Purana then proceeds (ix. 14, 43 ff.):—*Tasya saṁstu-*

ceding verses] generally described the manner in which the Vedas were divided, [the author] now states [as follows], with the view of determining particularly [what was done] in the Vaivasvata Manvantara."

vatas tushṭā agnisthālīṁ dadur nṛipa | Ūrvaśīm manyamānas tāṁ so'budhyata charan vane || Sthālīṁ nyasya vane gatvā gṛihān ādhyāyato niśi || Tretāyāṁ sampravṛittāyām manasi trayy avarttata || Sthālī-sthānaṁ gato 'śvatthaṁ śamī-garbhaṁ vilaxya saḥ | Tena dve araṇī kritvā Ūrvaśī-loka-kāmyayā || Ūrvaśīm mantrato dhyāyann adharāraṇim uttarām | Ātmānam ubhayor madhye yat tat prajananaṁ prabhuḥ | Tasya nirmathanāj jāto jātavedā vibhāvasuḥ | Trayyā cha vidyayā rājñā putratve kalpitas trivṛit | Tenāyajata yajñeśaṁ bhagavantam adhoxajam | Ūrvaśī-lokam anvichhan sarva-devamayaṁ Harim | Eka eva purā vedaḥ praṇavaḥ sarva-vāṅgmayaḥ | Devo nārāyaṇo nānya eko 'gnir varṇa eva cha | Purūravasa evāsīt trayī tretā-mukhe nṛipa | Agninā prajayā rājā lokaṁ gāndharvam eyivān. "The Gandharvas, gratified by his praises, gave him a platter containing fire. This he [at first] surposed to be Ūrvaśī, but became aware [of his mistake], as he wandered in the wood. Having placed the platter in the forest, Purūravas went home; and as he was meditating in the night, after the Tretā age had commenced, the triple Veda appeared before his mind.[22] Returning to the spot where he had placed the platter, he beheld an *aśvattha* tree springing out of a *śamī* tree, and formed from it two pieces of wood. Longing to attain the world where Ūrvaśī dwelt, he imagined to himself, according to the sacred text, Ūrvaśī as the lower and himself as the upper piece of wood, and their offspring as lying between the two. Fire was generated from the friction, and, according to the threefold science [Veda], was under its triple form, recognised by the king as his son. With this seeking to attain the heaven of Ūrvaśī, he worshipped the divine Hari, the lord of sacrifice, Adhoxaja, formed of the substance of all the gods. There was formerly only one Veda, the sacred monosyllable *om*, the essence of all speech; only one god, Nārāyana; only one Agni, and [one] caste. From Purūravas came the triple Veda in the beginning of the Tretā age.

[22] *Karma-bodhakam vedatrayaṁ prādurabhūt.* "The three Vedas, ordainers of rites, were manifested to him," as the scholiast explains.

Through Agni, his son, the king attained the heaven of the Gandharvas."[23]

On the close of this passage the commentator remarks :—*Nanv anādir veda-traya-bodhito brāhmaṇādīnām Indrādyaneka-deva-yajanena svarga-prāpti-hetuḥ karma-mārgaḥ kathaṁ sādir iva varṇyate | Tatrāha 'eka eva' iti dvābhyām | Purā kṛita-yuge sarva-vāṅg-mayaḥ sarvāsāṁ vāchāṁ vīja-bhūtaḥ praṇava eka eva vedaḥ | Devaścha Nārāyaṇa eka eva | Agniścha eka eva laukikaḥ | Varṇaścha eka eva haṁso nāma | Vedatrayī tu Purūravasaḥ sakāśād āsīt . . . Ayam bhāvaḥ | kṛita-yuge sattva-pradhānāḥ prāyaśaḥ sarve 'pi dhyānanishṭhāḥ | rajaḥ-pradhāne tu Tretā-yuge vedādi-vibhāgena karmamārgāḥ prakaṭo babhūva ityarthaḥ.* "How is it that the eternal method of works, which is pointed out by the three Vedas, and through which Brahmans and others, by worshipping Indra and many other gods, attain to paradise, is spoken of [in the preceding verses] as if it had a beginning in time? He [the author of the Purana] answers this in these two verses. Formerly, *i.e.* in the Kṛita age, there was only one Veda, the sacred monosyllable *om*, the essence of all words, *i.e.* that which is the seed of all words; and there was only one god, Nārayana; only one fire, that for common uses; and only one caste, the Hansa. But the triple Veda came from Purūravas. . . . The meaning is this: in the Kṛita age the quality of goodness predominated in men, who were almost all absorbed in meditation. But in the Tretā age, when passion (*rajas*) prevailed, the method of works was manifested by the division of the Vedas."[24]

This last quoted passage of the Bhāgavata gives, as I have inti-

[23] This story is also told in a prose passage in the Vish. Pur. iv. 6 (Wilson, p. 394). It is there stated that Purūravas divided fire, which was originally one, in a threefold manner. *Eko 'gnir ādāv abhavad Ailena tu atra manvantare traitā pravarttitā.* No mention, however, is there made of his having divided the Vedas, or partitioned society into castes.

[24] This legend is borrowed from the S'atapatha Brahmana, xi. 5, 1, 1 ff. (p. 855–858 Weber's ed.), where the motive for its introduction is to describe the process by which fire was generated by Purūravas in obedience to the command of the Gandharvas, as the means of his admission into their paradise. See Professor Müller's translation of this story in the Oxford Essays for 1856, pp. 62, 63. The legend is founded on the 95th hymn of the tenth book of the Rig-veda.

mated, a different account of the division of the Vedas from that contained in the text previously adduced from the same work, and in the citations from the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas. The one set of passages speak of the Veda as having been divided by Vyāsa into four parts in the Dvāpara age; while the text last cited speaks of the triple Veda as having originated with Purūravas in the Tretā age; and evidently belonged to a different tradition from the former three. The legend which speaks of three Vedas is likely to be more ancient than that which speaks of four, as it was not till a comparatively late date that the Atharva asserted its right to be ranked with the three others as a fourth Veda. This earlier tradition, however, appears to have had its origin partly in etymological considerations. The word Tretā, though designating the *second* Yuga, means a triad, and seems to have been suggested to the writer's mind by the triple fire mentioned in the legend.

Mahābhārata.—The following passage from the Mahābhārata, Sāntiparva (verses 13,088 ff.), agrees partially in tenor with the second passage from the Bhāgavata, but is silent regarding Purūravas:—*Idaṁ kṛitayugaṁ nāma kālaḥ śreshṭhaḥ pravarttitaḥ | Ahiṁsyā yajñapaśavo yuge 'smin na tad anyathā || Chatushpāt śakalo dharmo bhavishyaty atra vai surāḥ | Tatas Tretā yugaṁ nāma trayī yatra bhavishyati || Proxitā yajñapaśavo badhaṁ prāpsyanti vai makhe*[25] *| Yatra pādaś chaturtho vai dharmasya na bhavishyati || Tato vai dvāparaṁ nāma miśraḥ kālo bhavishyati.* "This present Kṛita age is the best of all the yugas; in it it is unlawful to slay any animals for sacrifice; in this age righteousness shall consist of all its four portions and be entire. Then shall follow the Tretā age, in which the triple

[25] Manu (i. 85, 86) differs from this passage of the Mahābhārata in making the Dvāpara the age of sacrifice;—*Anye kṛitayuge dharmās Tretāyāṁ Dvāpare pare | Anye kaliyuge nṛīnāṁ yuga-hrāsānurūpataḥ | Tapaḥ paraṁ Kṛitayuge Tretāyāṁ jñānam uchyate | Dvāpare yajñam evāhur dānam ekaṁ kalau yuge.* "Different duties are practised by men in the Krita age, and different duties in the Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali ages, in proportion to the decline in those yugas. Devotion is said to be supreme in the Krita, knowledge in the Tretā, sacrifice in the Dvāpara, and liberality alone in the Kali."

Veda shall arise, and animals fit for sacrifice shall be slaughtered as oblations. In that age the fourth part of righteousness shall be wanting. Next shall succeed the Dvāpara, a mixed period."

The M. Bh. (Śāntip. 13,475) relates that two Asuras, who beheld Brahmā creating the Vedas, suddenly snatched them up and ran off. Brahmā laments their loss, exclaiming, *Vedo me paramaṁ chaxur vedo me paramam balam | . . . Vedān ṛite hi kiṁ kuryāṁ lokānāṁ sṛishtim uttamām.* "The Veda is my principal eye; the Veda is my principal strength. . . . What shall I do without the Vedas, the most excellent creation in the universe?" They were, however, recovered and restored to Brahmā (v. 13,506 ff.)

Vishṇu-purāṇa.—The following verse, Vish. Pur. iii. 2, 12 (Wilson, p. 269), refers to the periodical disappearance of the Vedas:—*Chaturyugānte vedānāṁ jāyate kaliviplavaḥ | pravarttayanti tān etya bhuvi saptarshayo divaḥ.* "At the end of the four ages (*yugas*) the disappearance of the Vedas, incident to the kali, takes place. The seven rishis come from heaven to earth, and again give them currency." (Compare M. Bh. Śāntip. 7,660, which will be quoted further on.)

SECT. V.—*Accounts in the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas of the schisms between the adherents of the Yajur-veda, Vaiśampāyana and Yājñavalkya; hostility of the Ātharvaṇas towards the other Vedas; and of the Chhandogas towards the Rig-veda.*

The Vishnu Purana, iii. 5, 2 ff. (Wilson, p. 279 ff.), gives the following legend regarding the way in which the Yajur-veda came to be divided into two schools, the black and the white:—*Yājñavalkyas tu tasyābhūd Brahmarātasuto dvija | Śishyaḥ parama-dharmajño guru-vṛitti-paraḥ sadā | Ṛishir yo 'dya mahāmeruṁ samāje nāgamishyati | Tasya vai sapta-rātrantu brahma-hatyā bhavishyati | Pūrvam eva muni-gaṇaiḥ samayo 'bhūt kṛito dvija | Vaiśampāyana ekas tu taṁ vyatikrāntavāṁs tadā | Svaśrīyam bālakaṁ so 'tha padā śprishṭam aghātayat |*

Śishyān āha sa bhoḥ śishyā brahma-hatyāpahaṁ vratam | Charadhvam matkṛite sarve na vichāryyam idam tathā | Athāha Yājñavalkyas taṁ kim ebhir bhagavan dvijaiḥ | Kleśitair alpatejobhir charishye 'ham idaṁ vratam | Tataḥ kruddho guruḥ prāha Yājñavalkyam mahāmatiḥ | Muchyatāṁ yat tvayā 'dhītam matto viprāvamanyaka | Nistejaso vadasy etān yas tvam brāhmaṇa-puṇgavān | Tena śishyeṇa nārtho 'sti mamājñā--bhaṇgakāriṇā | Yājñavalkyas tataḥ prāha bhaktau tat te mayoditam | Mamāpy alaṁ tvayā 'dhītaṁ yad mayā tad idaṁ dvija | Ity uktvā rudhirāktāni sarūpāṇi yajūṁshi saḥ | Chhardayitvā dadau tasmai yayau cha svechhayā muniḥ | yajūṁshy atha visṛishtāni yājñavalkyena vai dvija | Jagṛihus tittirībhūtvā Taittirīyās tu te tataḥ | Brahma-hatyā-vratam chīrṇam guruṇā choditais tu yaiḥ | Charakādhvaryavas te tu charaṇād munisattamāḥ | Yājñavalkyo 'tha Maitreya prāṇāyāma-parāyaṇaḥ | tushṭāva prayataḥ sūryam yajūṁshy abhilashaṁs tataḥ | . . . Ity evamādibhistena stūyamanaḥ stavaiḥ raviḥ | vāji-rūpa-dharaḥ prāha vṛiyatām iti vāñchhitam | Yājñavalkyas tadā prāha praṇipatya divākaram | yajūṁshi tāni me dehi yāni santi na me gurau | Evam ukto dadau tasmai yajūṁshi bhagavān raviḥ | ayātayāma-saṁjñāni yāni vetti na tadguruḥ | Yajūṁshi yair adhītāni tāni viprair dvijottama | vājinas te samākhyātāḥ sūryo 'śvaḥ so 'bhavad yataḥ.

"Yājnavalkya, son of Brahmarāti, was his [Vaiśampāyana's] disciple, eminently versed in duty, and obedient to his teacher. An agreement had formerly been made by the Munis that any one of their number who should fail to attend at an assembly on Mount Meru on a certain day should incur the guilt of Brahmanicide during [within?] a period of seven nights. Vaiśampāyana was the only person who infringed this agreement, and he in consequence occasioned the death of his sister's child by touching it with his foot. He then desired all his disciples to perform in his behalf an expiation which should take away his guilt, and forbade any hesitation. Yājnavalkya then said to him, 'Reverend sir, what is the necessity for these faint and feeble Brahmins? *I* will perform the expiation.' The wise teacher,

incensed, replied to Yājnavalkya, 'Contemner of Brahmans, give up all that thou hast learnt from me; I have no need of a disobedient disciple, who, like thee, stigmatizes these eminent Brahmans as feeble.' Yājnavalkya rejoined, 'It was from devotion [to thee] that I said what I did; but I, too, have done with thee: here is all that I have learnt from thee.' Having spoken, he vomited forth the identical Yajush texts tainted with blood, and giving them to his master, he departed at his will. [The other pupils] having then become transformed into partridges (*tittiri*), picked up the Yajush texts, and were thence called Taittirīyas. And those who had by their teacher's command performed the expiation, were from this performance (*charana*) called Charakādhvaryus. Yājnavalkya then, who was habituated to the exercise of suppressing his breath, devoutly hymned the sun, desiring to obtain Yajush texts . . . [I pass over the hymn.] Thus celebrated with these and other praises, the sun assumed the form of a horse, and said, 'Ask whatever boon thou desirest.' Yājnavalkya then, prostrating himself before the lord of day, replied, 'Give me such Yajush texts as my teacher does not possess.' Thus supplicated, the sun gave him the Yajush texts called *Ayātayāma*, which were not known to his master. Those by whom these texts were studied were called Vājins, because the sun (when he gave them) assumed the shape of a horse (*vāji*)."

I quote also the parallel text from the Vāyu Purana, as it exhibits some slight variations from the preceding, (Vāyu Pur. Aufr. Cat. p. 55):—*Kāryam āsīd ṛishīṇāñcha kiñchid brāhmaṇa-sattamāḥ | Meru-pṛishṭhaṁ samāsādya tais tadā 'stviti mantritam | Yo no 'tra sapta-rātreṇa nāgachhed dvija-sattamāḥ | sa kuryād brahma-badhyāṁ vai samayo naḥ prakīrttitaḥ | Tatas te saganāḥ sarve Vaiśampāyana-varjitāḥ | Prayayuḥ saptarātreṇa yatra sandhiḥ kṛito 'bhavat | Brāhmaṇānāntu vachanād brahma-badhyāṁ chakāra saḥ | Śishyān atha samānīya sa Vaiśampāyano 'bravīt | Brahma-badhyāṁ charadhvaṁ vai matkṛite dvijah-sattamāḥ | sarve yūyaṁ samāgamya brūta me taddhitaṁ*

vachaḥ | Yājñavalkya uvācha | Aham eva charishyāmi tishṭhantu munayas tv ime | balañchotthāpayishyāmi tapasā svena bhāvitaḥ | Evam uktas tataḥ kruddho Yājñavalkyam athābravīt | uvācha yat tvayā 'dhītaṁ sarvam pratyarpayasva me | Evam uktaḥ sarūpāṇi yajūṁshi pradadau guroḥ | rudhireṇa tathā 'ktāni chharditvā brahma-vittamaḥ | Tataḥ sa dhyānam āsthāya sūryam ārādhayad dvijaḥ | sūrya brahma yad uchchhinnaṁ khaṁ gatvā pratitishṭhati | Tato yāni gatāny ūrddhaṁ yajūṁshy āditya-maṇḍalam | Tāni tasmai dadau tushṭaḥ sūryo vai Brāhmarātaye | Aśvarūpaścha mārttaṇḍo Yājñavalkyāya dhīmate | Yajūṁshy adhīyate yāni brahmaṇā yena kenachit | aśvarūpāṇi dattāni tatas te Vājino 'bhavan | brahma-hatyā tu yaiś chīrṇā charaṇāt charakāḥ smṛitāḥ | Vaiśampāyana-śishyās te charakāḥ samudāhṛitāḥ. "The rishis having a certain occasion, met on the summit of Mount Meru, when, after consultation, they resolved and agreed together that any one of their number who should fail to attend there for seven nights should be involved in the guilt of brahmanicide. They all in consequence resorted to the appointed place for seven nights along with their attendants. Vaiśampāyana alone was absent, and he, according to the word of the Brahmans, committed brahmanicide. He then assembled his disciples, and desired them to perform, on his behalf, an expiation for his offence, and to meet and tell him what was salutary for the purpose. Yājnavalkya then said, 'I myself will perform the penance; let all these munis refrain: inspired by my own devotion, I shall raise up strength.' Incensed at this speech of Yājnavalkya [Vaiśampāyana] said to him, 'Restore all that thou hast learned.' Thus addressed, the sage, deeply versed in sacred lore, vomited forth the identical Yajush texts stained with blood, and delivered them to his teacher. Plunged in meditation, the Brahman then adored the sun, saying, 'Sun, every sacred text which disappears [from the earth] goes to the sky, and there abides.' The sun, gratified, and [appearing] in the form of a horse, bestowed on Yājnavalkya, son of Brahmarāta, all the Yajush texts which had ascended to the solar region. All the

Yajush texts which are [?] studied by any priest, were given in the form of horses, [?] and in consequence these priests became Vājins. And the disciples of Vaiśampāyana, by whom the expiatory rite was accomplished, were called *Charakas*, from its accomplishment (*charana*)."[26]

It is sufficiently evident from the preceding legend that the adherents of the two different divisions of the Yajurveda (the Taittiriya or black, and the Vājasaneyi or white), must in ancient times have regarded each other with feelings of the greatest hostility—feelings akin to those with which the followers of the rival deities, Vishnu and Śiva, look upon each other in modern days. On this subject I quote an extract from Professor Weber's "History of Indian Literature."

P. 84.—"Whilst the theologians of the Rik are called Bahvrichas, and those of the Sāman Chhandogas, the old name for the divines of the Yajush is Adhvaryu; and these old appellations are to be found in the Sanhitā of the Black Yajush (the Taittirīya), and in the Brahmana of the White Yajush (the Śatapatha Brahmana). The latter work applies the term Adhvaryus to its own adherents, whilst their opponents are denominated Charakādhvaryus, and are the objects of censure. This hostility is also exhibited in a passage of the Sanhitā of the White Yajush, where the Charakāchārya, as one of the human sacrifices to be offered at the Purushamedha, is devoted to Dushkrita or Sin."[27]

[26] In a note to p. 461 of his Translation of the Vishnu Purana, Professor Wilson mentions the following legend illustrative of the effects of this schism. "The Vāyu and Matsya relate, rather obscurely, a dispute between Janamejaya and Vaiśampāyana, in consequence of the former's patronage of the Brahmans of the Vājasaneyi branch of the Yajur-veda, in opposition to the latter, who was the author of the Black or original Yajush. Janamejaya twice performed the Aśvamedha according to the Vājasaveyi ritual, and established the Trisarvī, or use of certain texts by Aśmaka and others, by the Brahmans of Anga, and by those of the middle country. He perished, however, in consequence, being cursed by Vaiśampāyana. Before their disagreement, Vaiśampāyana related the Mahābhārata to Janamejaya."

[27] Vājasaneyi Sanhitā xxx. 18 (p. 846 of Weber's ed.):—*Dushkṛitāya charakāchāryyam* | (*charakāṇāṁ gurum*—Scholiast). Prof. Müller also says (Anc. Sans. Lit. p. 350), "This name Charaka is used in one of the Khilas" (the passage just quoted) "of the Vajasaneyi Sanhitā as a term of reproach. In the 30th Adhyāya a list of people is given who are to be sacrificed at the Purushamedha, and among them we

In his Indische Studien (iii. 454) Prof. Weber specifies the following passages in the Śatapatha Brahmana as those in which the Charakas, or Charakādhvaryus are censured, viz., iii. 8, 2, 24; iv. 1, 2, 19; iv. 2, 3, 15; iv. 2, 4, 1; vi. 2, 2, 1, 10; viii. 1, 3, 7; viii. 7, 1, 14, 24. Of these I quote one specimen (iv. 1, 2, 19): —*Tā u ha Charakā nānaiva mantrābhyāṁ juhvati prāṉodānau kurma iti vadantaḥ | Tad u tathā na kuryāt | mohayanti ha te yajamānasya prāṉodānāv apīdvā enam tūshṉīm juhuyāt.* "These the Charakas offer respectively with two mantras, saying thus: 'These are his two breathings,' and 'we thus make these two breathings endowed with their respective powers.' But let no one adopt this procedure, for they confound the breathings of the worshipper. Wherefore let this libation be offered in silence."[28]

But these sectarian jealousies were not confined to the different schools of the Yajur-veda; the adherents of the Atharva-veda seem to have evinced a similar spirit of hostility towards the followers of the other Vedas. On this subject Prof. Weber remarks as follows in his Indische Studien, i. 296. "A good deal of animosity is generally displayed in most of the writings connected with the Atharvan towards the other three Vedas; but the strongest expression is given to this feeling in the first of the Atharva Pariśishtas, chapter cxii."

He then proceeds to quote the following passage from that work and chapter:—*Bahvṛicho hanti vai rāshṭram adhvaryur nāśayet sutān | Chhandogo dhanaṁ nāśayet tasmād Ātharvaṉo guruḥ | Ajñānād vā pramādād vā yasya syād bahvṛicho guruḥ | deśa-rāshṭra-purāmātya-nāśas tasya na saṁśayaḥ | yadi vā*

find the Charākāchārya as the proper victim to be offered to Dushkrita or Sin. This passage, together with similar hostile expressions in the Śatapatha Brahmana, were evidently dictated by a feeling of animosity against the ancient schools of the Adhvaryus, whose sacred texts we possess in the Taittirīya-veda, and from whom Yājnavalkya seceded in order to become himself the founder of the new Charanas of the Vājasaneyins."

[28] Though aided by a learned friend in rendering this passage, I am not certain of the perfect exactness of the translation. But there is no doubt whatever that the tendency of the text is hostile to the rival school of the Charakas.

'dhvaryavaṁ rājā niyunakti purohitam | śastrena badhyate xipram parixīṇārtha-vāhanaḥ | yathaiva paṇgur adhvānam apaxī chāṇḍa-bhojanam | evaṁ chhandoga-guruṇā rājā vṛiddhiṁ na gachhati | purodhā jalado yasya maudo vā syāt kathañchana | abdād daśabhyo māsebhyo rāshṭra-bhraṁśaṁ sa gachhati. "A Bahvṛicha (Rig-veda priest) will destroy a kingdom; an Adhvaryu (Yajur-veda priest) will destroy offspring; and a Chhandoga (Sāma-veda priest) will destroy wealth;—hence an Atharvana priest is the [proper] spiritual adviser. Destruction of country, kingdom, cities, and ministers is certainly incurred by the [king] who, through ignorance or folly, takes a Bahvṛicha priest for his guide. Or if a king appoints an Adhvaryu priest to be his domestic chaplain, he loses his wealth and his chariots, and is speedily slain by the sword. As a lame man [makes no progress] on a road, and a creature which is not a bird [cannot] eat eggs [?], so no king prospers who has a Chhandoga for his teacher. He who has a *Jalada* or a *Mauda* for his priest, loses his kingdom after a year or ten months."

"Thus," continues Prof. Weber, "the author of the Pariśishta attacks certain sākhās of the Atharva-veda itself, for such are the Jaladas and the Maudas, and admits only a Bhārgava, a Paippalāda, or a Śaunaka to be a properly qualified teacher. He further declares that the Atharva-veda is intended only for the highest order of priest, the brahman, not for the three other inferior sorts."

The following passage is then quoted:—*Atharvā sṛijate ghoram adbhutaṁ śamayet tathā | atharvā raxate yajñam yajñasya patir Angirāḥ | Divyāntarixa-bhaumānām utpātānām anekadhā | śamayita brahma-veda-jñas tāsmād daxiṇato Bhṛiguḥ | Brahmā śamayed nādhvaryur na chhandogo na bahvṛichaḥ | raxāṁsi raxati brahmā brahmā tasmād atharva-vit.* "The Atharva priest creates horrors, and he also allays alarming occurrences; he protects the sacrifice, of which Angiras is the lord. He who is skilled in the Brahma-veda (the Atharva) can allay manifold portents, celestial, atmospheric, and terrestrial, wherefore the

Bhṛigu [is to be placed] on the right hand. It is the brahman, and not the adhvaryu, the chhandoga, or the bahvricha, who can allay [portents]; the brahman wards off [?] raxases, wherefore the brahman is he who knows the Atharva."

I subjoin another extract from Prof. Weber's Indische Studien, i. 63 ff., partly to complete what was said on the relation of the Sāma-veda to the Rig-veda in Part Second of this work, pp. 202, 203, and partly to illustrate the mutual hostility of the different schools. "To understand the relation of the Sāma-veda to the Rig-veda, we have only to form to ourselves a clear and distinct idea of the manner in which these hymns in general arose, how they were then carried to a distance by those tribes which emigrated onward, and how they were by them regarded as sacred, whilst in their original home, they were either—as living in the immediate consciousness of the people—subjected to modifications corresponding to the lapse of time, or made way for new hymns by which they were pushed aside, and so became forgotten. It is a foreign country which first surrounds familiar things with a sacred charm; emigrants continue to occupy their ancient mental position, preserving what is old with painful exactness, while at home life opens out for itself new paths. New emigrants follow those who had first left their home, and unite with those who are already settlers in a new country. And now the old and the new hymns and usages are fused into one mass, and are faithfully, but uncritically, learned and imbibed by travelling pupils from different masters (several stories in the Vrihad Aranyaka are especially instructive on this point, see Ind. Stud. p. 83), so that a varied intermixture arises. Others, again, more learned, then strive to introduce arrangement, to bring together what is homogeneous, to separate what is distinct; and in this way theological intolerance springs up; without which the rigid formation of a text or a canon is impossible. The influence of courts on this process is not to be overlooked; as, for example, in the case of Janaka, King of Videha, who in Yājnavalkya had found his Homer. Anything approaching to a

clear insight into the reciprocal relations of the different schools will in vain be sought either from the Puranas or the Charana-vyūha, and can only be attained by comparing the teachers named in the different Brahmanas and Sūtras, partly with each other and partly with the text of Pānini and the gaṇapāṭha and commentary connected therewith (for the correction of which a thorough examination of Patanjali would offer the only sufficient guarantee). For the rest, the relation between the S. V. and the R. V. is in a certain degree analogous to that between the White and the Black Yajush; and, as in the Brahmana of the former (the Śatapatha Br.) we often find those teachers who are the representatives of the latter, mentioned with contempt, it cannot surprise us, if in the Brahmana of the Sāma-veda, the Paingins and Kaushītakins are similarly treated."

It will have become sufficiently manifest to the reader of the preceding passages which I have extracted from the Puranas concerning the division and different Śākhās of the Vedas, that the traditions which they embody contain very little real information in regard to the composition of the hymns, or the manner in which they were preserved, collected, or arranged. In fact, I have not adduced these passages for the purpose of elucidating those points, but to show the legendary character of the narratives, and their discrepancies in matters of detail. For an account of the Śākhās of the Vedas, the ancient schools of the Brahmans, and other matters of a similar nature, I must refer to the excellent work of Prof. Müller, the "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature," pp. 119-132 and 364-388 and elsewhere.

SECT. VI.—*Reasonings of the Commentators on the Vedas, in support of the authority of the Vedas.*

I proceed now to adduce some extracts from the works of the more systematic authors who have treated of the origin and authority of the Vedas, I mean the commentators on these books themselves, and the authors and expositors of the aphorisms of

several of the schools of Hindu philosophy. Whatever we may think of the premises from which these writers set out, or of the conclusions at which they arrive, we cannot fail to be struck with the contrast which their speculations exhibit to the loose and mystical ideas of the Puranas and Upanishads, or to admire the acuteness of their reasoning, and the logical precision with which their arguments are presented.

I.—The first passage which I shall adduce is from Sāyana's introduction to his commentary on the Rig-veda, the Vedārtha-prakāśa, pp. 3 ff. (Sāyana, as we have seen in Part Second, p. 172, lived in the 14th century, A.D.) *Nanu Veda eva tāvad nāsti | kutas tadavāntara-viśesha ṛigvedaḥ | Tathā hi | ko 'yaṁ vedo nāma | na hi tatra laxaṇaṁ pramāṇaṁ vā 'sti | nacha tad-ubhaya-vyatirekeṇa kiṅchid vastu prasidhyati | Laxaṇa-pramāṇā-bhyāṁ hi vastu-siddhir iti nyāyavidām matam | Pratyaxānumān-āgameshu pramāṇa-viśesheshu antimo Veda iti tallaxaṇam iti chet | na | Manvādi-smṛitishu ativyāpteḥ | Samaya-balena sam-yak paroxānubhava-sādhanam ity etasya āgama-laxaṇasya tās-vapi sadbhāvāt | apaurusheyatve sati iti viśeshaṇād adosha iti chet | na | Vedasyāpi parameśvara-nirmitatvena paurusheyatvāt | Śarīra-dhāri-jīva-nirmitatvābhāvād apaurusheyatvam iti chet | [na ?] | 'Sahasra-śīrshā purusha' ityādi-śrutibhir īśvarasyāpi śarīritvāt | Karma-phala-rūpa-śarīra-dhāri-jīva-nirmitatvābhāva-mātreṇa apaurusheyatvaṁ vivaxitam iti chet | na | Jīva-viśeshair Agni-Vāyv-Ādityair vedānām utpāditatvāt | 'Ṛigveda evāgner ajāyata Yajurvedo vāyoḥ Sāmaveda ādityād' iti śruter īśvara-sya agnyādi-prerakatvena nirmātṛitvaṁ drashṭavyam | mantra-brāhmaṇātmakaḥ śabda-rāśir veda iti chet | na | Īdṛiśo mantraḥ | īdṛiśam brāhmaṇam ity anayor adyāpi anirṇītatvāt | Tasmād nāsti kiṅchid vedasya laxaṇam | Nāpi tat-sadbhāve pramāṇaṁ paśyāmaḥ | 'Ṛigvedaṁ bhagavo 'dhyemi Yajurvedaṁ Sāmave-dam Ātharvaṇam chaturtham' ityādi vākyaṁ pramāṇam iti chet | na | tasyāpi vākyasya vedāntaikapātitvena ātmāśrayatva-prasaṇ-gāt | Na khalu nipuṇo 'pi svaskandham āroḍhuṁ prabhaved iti | 'Veda eva dvijātīnāṁ niḥśreyasa-karaḥ paraḥ' iti ādi smṛiti-*

vākyaṁ pramāṇam iti chet | na | tasyāpy ukta-śruti-mūlatvena nirākṛitatvāt | pratyaxādikaṁ śaṇkitum apy ayogyam | Veda-vishayā loka-prasiddhiḥ sārvajanīnā 'pi nīlaṁ nabha ityādivad bhrāntā | Tasmāl laxaṇa-pramāṇa-rahitasya vedasya sadbhāvo na aṇgīkarttuṁ śakyate iti pūrvapaxaḥ |

Atra uchyate | mantra-brāhmaṇātmakaṁ tāvad adushṭaṁ laxaṇam | ata eva Āpastambo yajña-paribhāshāyām evāha 'mantra-brāhmaṇayor veda-nāmadheyam' iti | tayostu rūpam uparishṭhād nirṇeshyate | apaurusheya-vākyatvam iti idam api yādriśam asmābhir vivaxitaṁ tādriśam uttaratra spashṭī-bhavishyati | pramāṇāny api yathoktāni śruti-smṛiti-lokaprasiddhi-rūpāṇi veda-sadbhāve drashṭavyāni | Yathā ghaṭa-paṭādi-dravyānām sva-prakāśatvābhāve 'pi sūryachandrādīnāṁ sva-prakāśatvam avirudham tathā manushyādīnāṁ svaskandhārohāsambhave 'py akuṇṭhita-śakter vedasya itara-vastu-pratipādakatvavat sva-pratipādakatvam apy astu | Ata eva sampradāya-vido 'kuṇṭhitāṁ śaktim vedasya darśayanti 'chodanā ni bhūtam bhavishyantaṁ sūxmaṁ vyavahitaṁ viprakṛishtam ity evañjātīyam artham śaknoty avagamayitum' iti | Tathā sati veda-mūlāyāḥ smṛites tadubhaya-mūlāyā loka-prasiddheścha prāmāṇyaṁ durvāram | Tasmāl laxaṇa-pramāṇa-siddho vedo na kenāpi chārvākādinā 'podhuṁ śakyate iti sthitam ||

Naw astu nāma Vedākhyaḥ kāśchit padārthaḥ | tathāpi nāsau vyākhyānam arhati apramāṇatvena anupayuktatvāt | Na hi Vedaḥ pramāṇaṁ tallaxaṇasya tatra duḥsampādatvāt | tathā hi 'samyag anubhava-sādhanam pramāṇam' iti kechil laxaṇam āhuḥ | āpare tu 'anadhigatārtha-gantṛi pramāṇam' ity āchaxate | na chaitad ubhayam vede sambhavati | mantra-brāhmaṇātmako hi vedaḥ | tatra mantrāḥ kechid abodhakāḥ | 'amyak sā ta Indra ṛishṭir' ityeko mantraḥ | 'Yādriśmin dhāyi tam ayasyayā vidad' ity anyaḥ | 'Śṛiṇyeva jarbharī turpharītū' ityaparaḥ | 'Āpānta-manyus tṛiphala-prabharmā' ityādaya udāhāryāḥ | na hy etair mantraiḥ kaśchid apy artho 'vabudhyate | eteshv anubhavo eva yadā nāsti tadā tatsamyaktvaṁ tadīya-sādhanatvañcha dūrāpetam | 'Adhaḥ svid āsīd upari svid āsīd' iti mantrasya

bodhakatve 'pi 'sthāṇur vā purusho vā' ityādi-vākya-vat sandigdhārtha-bodhakatvād nāsti prāmāṇyam | 'Oshadhe trāyasvainam' iti mantro darbha-vishayaḥ | 'Svadhite mainaṁ hiṁsīr' iti xuravishayaḥ | 'Śṛiṇota grāvāṇa' iti pāshāṇa-vishayaḥ | Eteshv achetanānāṁ darbha-xura-pāshāṇānāṁ chetana-vat sambodhanaṁ śrūyate | tato 'dvau chandramasāv' iti vākya-vad viparītārtha-bodhakatvād aprāmāṇyam | 'Eka eva Rudro na dvitīyo 'vatasthe' | 'sahasrāṇi sahasraśo ye Rudrā adhi bhūmyām' ity anayos tu mantrayor 'yāvajjīvam aham maunī' iti vākyavad vyāghāta-bodhakatvād aprāmāṇyam | 'Āpa undantu' iti mantro yajamānasya xaura-kāle jalena śiraśaḥ kledanam brūte | 'Śubhike śira aroha śobhayantī mukham mama' iti mantro vivāha-kāle maṇgalācharaṇārtham pushpa-nirmitāyā śubhikāyā varabadhvoḥ śirasy avasthānam brūte | tayoścha mantrayor loka-prasiddhārthānuvāditvād anadhigatārtha-gantṛitvaṁ nāsti | tasmād mantra-bhāgo na pramāṇam |

Atra uchyate | Amyagādi-mantrāṇām artho Yāskena niruktagranthe 'vabodhitaḥ | tat-parichaya-rahitānām anavabodho na mantrāṇāṁ doshām āvahati | Ata evātra loka-nyāyam udāharanti 'naisha sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati | purushāparādho sambhavati' iti | 'Adhaḥ svid āsīd' iti mantraścha na sandeha-prabodhanāya pravṛittaḥ kiṁtarhi jagatkāraṇasya paravastuno 'tigambhīratvaṁ niśchetum eva pravṛittaḥ | tadartham eva hi guruśāstra-sampradāya-rahitair durbodhyatvam 'adhaḥ svid' ity anayā vacho-bhaṇgyā upanyasyati | Sa evābhiprāya uparitanesha 'ko addhā veda' ity ādi-mantreshu spashṭī-kṛitaḥ | 'Oshadhy' ādi mantreshv api chetanā eva tattadabhimāni-devatās tena tena nāmnā sambodhyante | tāścha devatā bhagavatā Bādarāyaṇena 'abhimāni-vyapadeśastu' iti sūtre sūtritāḥ | Ekasyāpi Rudrasya sva-mahimnā sahasra-mūrtti-svīkārād nāsti parasparaṁ vyāghātaḥ | Jalādi-dravyeṇa śiraḥ-kledanāder loka-siddhatve 'pi tad-abhimāni-devatānugrahasya aprasiddhatvāt tadvishayatvena ajñātārtha-jñāpakatvam | tato lakṣaṇa-sadbhāvād asti mantra-bhāgasya pramāṇyam.

"But, some will say, there is no such thing as a Veda;

how, then, can there be a Rig-veda, forming a particular part of it? For what is this Veda? It has no characteristic sign or evidence; and without these two conditions, nothing can be proved to exist. For logicians hold that 'a thing is established by characteristic signs and by proof.' If you answer that 'of the three kinds of proof, *perception*, *inference*, and *scripture*, the Veda is the last, and that this is its sign;' then the objectors rejoin that this is not true, for this sign extends too far, and includes also *Manu and the other Smritis;* since there exists in them also this characteristic of Scripture, viz., that 'in virtue of common consent it is a perfect instrument for the discovery of what is invisible.' If you proceed, 'the Veda is faultless, in consequence of its characteristic that it has no person (*purusha*) for its author;' they again reply, 'Not so; for as the Veda was formed by Paramesvara (God), it had a person (*purusha*) for its author.' If you rejoin, 'It had no person (*purusha*) for its author, for it was not made by any embodied living being;'[they refuse[29] to admit this] on the ground that, according to such Vedic texts as 'Purusha has a thousand heads,' it is clear that Iśvara (God) also has a body. If you urge that *apaurusheyatva* ('the having had no personal author') means that it was not composed by a living being endowed with a body which was the result of works; —the opponent denies this also, and asserts that the Vedas were created by particular living beings,—Fire, Air, and the Sun; for from the text 'the Rig-veda sprang from fire, the Yajur-veda from air, and the Sāma-veda from the sun,' etc., it will be seen that Iśvara, by inciting fire and the others, was the maker. If you next say that the Veda is a collection of words in the form of Mantras and Brahmanas, the objectors rejoin, 'Not so, for it has never yet been defined that a Mantra is so and so, and a Brahmana so and so.' There exists, therefore, no *characteristic mark*

[29] I have translated this, as if there had been (which there is not) a negative particle *na* in the text, after the *iti chet*, as this seems to me to make the best sense. I understand from Prof. Müller that the negative particle is found in some of the MSS.

of a Veda. Nor do we see any *proof* that a Veda exists. If you say that the text, 'I peruse, reverend sir, the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, and the Atharva as the fourth,' is a proof, the antagonist answers, 'No, for as that text is part of the Veda, it is exposed to the objection of depending upon itself; for no one, be he ever so clever, can mount upon his own shoulders.' If you again urge that such texts of the Smṛiti as this, 'It is the Veda alone which is supreme, and the source of blessedness to twice-born men,' are proofs, the objector rejoins, 'Not so; since these too must be rejected, as being founded on the same Veda.' The evidence of the senses and other ordinary sources of knowledge ought not even to be doubted. And common report in reference to the Veda, though universal, is erroneous, like such phrases as 'the blue sky,' etc. Wherefore, as the Veda is destitute of characteristic sign and proof, its existence cannot be admitted. Such is the first side of the question.

"To this we reply:—The definition of the Veda, as a work composed of Mantra and Brahmana, is unobjectionable. Hence Āpastamba says in the Yajnaparibhāshā, *the name of Mantra and Brahmana is Veda.* The nature of these two things will be settled hereafter.[30] The sense we attach to the expression '*without any personal author*' will also be declared further on. Let the proofs which have been specified of the existence of the Veda, viz., the Veda (itself), the Smṛiti, and common notoriety, be duly weighed. Although jars, cloth, and other such [dark] objects have no inherent property of making themselves visible, it is no absurdity to speak of the sun, moon, and other luminous bodies, as shining by their own light. Just in the same way (though it is impossible for beings like men to mount on their own shoulders) let the all-penetrating Veda be held to have the power of proving

[30] See Part Second, p. 172. Madhava Achārya, the author of the Vedārtha-prakāśa on the Taittirīya Sanhitā, admits the priority of the Mantras or hymns to the Brahmanas in these words (p. 9):—*Yadyapi mantra-brāhmaṇātmako Vedas tathāpi brāhmaṇasya mantra-vyākhyāna-rūpatvāt mantrā evādau samāmnātāḥ.* "Though the Veda consists of Mantras and Brahmanas, yet as the Brahmanas are expository of the Mantras, the latter were first recorded."

itself as it has of proving other things.[31] Hence traditionists set forth this penetrating force of the Veda; thus, 'the Scripture is able to make known the past, the future, the minute, the near, the remote.' Such being the case, the authority of the Smṛiti, which is based on the Veda, and of common notoriety, which is based on both, is irresistible. Wherefore it stands fast that the Veda, which is established by characteristic sign, and by proof, cannot be refuted by Chārvākas or any other opponents.

"But let it be admitted that there is a thing called a Veda. Still it does not deserve, and is unfitted for, explanation, since it does not constitute proof. The Veda is no proof, as it is difficult to show that it has any sign of that character. Some define proof as the instrument of perfect apprehension; others say, it is that which conducts us to what was not before comprehended. But neither of these definitions can be reasonably applied to the Veda. For the Veda consists of *Mantra* and *Brahmana*. Of these mantras some convey no meaning. Thus one is *amyak sā ta*, etc.; another is *yadriśmin*, etc.; a third is *śṛinyeva*, etc. The texts *āpāntu*,[32] etc., and others are further examples. Now no meaning whatever is to be perceived through these mantras; and when they do not even convey an idea at all, much less can they convey a perfect idea, or be instruments of comprehension. Even if the mantra *adhaḥ svid āsīd upari svid āsīd*, 'was it below or above?' (R. V. x. 129, 5) convey a meaning, still, like such sayings as 'either a post or a man,' it conveys a dubious mean-

[31] The same thing had been said before by S'ankāra Achāryya (who lived at the end of the 8th or beginning of the 9th century, A.D. See Colebrooke's Misc. Essays, i. 332), in his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras ii. 1, 1. *Vedasya hi nirapexam svārthe prāmāṇyaṁ raver iva rūpa-vishaye | purusha-vachasāṁ tu mūlāntarāpexaṁ svarthe prāmāṇyaṁ vaktṛi-smṛiti-vyavahitañcha iti viprakarshaḥ.* "For the Veda has an independent power of demonstration in respect of itself, as the sun has of manifesting forms. The words of men, on the other hand, have a power of proving themselves, which is derived from another source [the Veda], and which is separated [from its source] by the recollection of the author. Herein consists the distinction [between the two kinds of evidence]."

[32] See Nirukta, v. 12, and vi. 15, and Roth's illustrations. It is not necessary for my purpose to inquire whether the charge of intelligibility brought against the texts is just or not.

ing, and so possesses no authority. The mantra, *deliver him, o plant*, has for its subject, grass. Another, '*do not hurt him, axe*,' has for its subject an axe (*xura*). A third, '*hear stones*,' has for its subject, stones. In these cases, grass, an axe, and stones, though insensible objects, are addressed in the Veda as if they were intelligent. Hence these passages have no authority, because, like the saying, 'two moons,' their import is absurd. So also the two texts, 'there is one Rudra, no second has existed,' and 'the thousand Rudras who are over the earth,' involving, as they do, a mutual contradiction (just as if one were to say, 'I have been silent all my life'), cannot be authoritative. The mantra *āpa undantu* expresses the wetting of the sacrificer's head with water at the time of tonsure; while the text '*śubhike*,' etc. ('garland, mount on my head and decorate my face') expresses the placing of a garland formed of flowers on the heads of the bridegroom and bride, by way of blessing, at the time of marriage. Now, as these two last texts merely repeat a matter of common notoriety, they cannot be said to conduct us to what was not before comprehended. Wherefore the Mantra portion of the Veda is destitute of authority.

"To this we reply, the meaning of these texts '*amyak*,' etc., and the others has been explained by Yāska in the Nirukta. The fact that they are not understood by persons ignorant of that explanation, does not prove any defect in the mantras. It is customary to quote here the popular maxim, 'it is not the fault of the post that the blind man does not see it; the reasonable thing to say is that it is the man's fault.' The mantra '*adhaḥ svid*,' etc. ('was it above or below?'), is not intended to convey doubt, but rather to signify the extreme profundity of the supreme Essence, the cause of the world. With this view the author intimates by this turn of expression the difficulty which persons who are not versed in the deep Scriptures have, in comprehending such subjects. The same intention is manifested in the preceding mantras *ko addhā veda*, etc. ('who knows?' etc.) In the texts *oshade*, etc. ('o herb,' etc.), also the deities who preside

over these several objects are addressed by these several names. These deities are referred to by the venerable Bādarāyana in the aphorism *abhimāni-vyapadeśaḥ*. As Rudra, though only one, assumes by his power a thousand forms, there is no contradiction between the different texts which relate to him. And though the moistening, etc., of the head by water, etc., is a matter of common notoriety, yet as the goodwill of the god who resides in these objects is not generally known, the text in question, by having that for its subject, is declaratory of what is unknown. Hence the Mantra portion of the Veda, being shown to have the characteristic mark [of constituting proof], is authoritative."

Sāyana then, in p. 11 of his Preface, proceeds to extend his argument to the Brahmanas, and concludes (p. 19) that the authority of the whole Veda is proved.

II.—The second passage which I shall quote is from the Vedārtha-prakāśa of Mādhava Āchāryya on the Taittirīya Yajurveda (pp. 1 ff. in the Bibliotheca Indica). Mādhava was the brother of Sāyana, and flourished in the middle of the 14th century. (Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 301.) *Nanu ko 'yaṁ vedo nāma ke vā asya vishaya-prayojana-sambandhādhikāriṇaḥ kathaṁ vā tasya prāmāṇyam | na khalv etasmin sarvasminn asati vedo vyākhyāna-yogyo bhavati | Atrochyate | Ishṭaprāpty-anishṭa-parihārayor alaukikam upāyaṁ yo grantho vedayati sa vedaḥ | Alaukika-padena pratyaxānumāne vyāvartyete | Anubhūyamānasya srak-chandana-vanitāder ishṭa-prāpti-hetutvam aushadha-sevāder anishṭa-pavihāra-hetutvañcha pratyaxa-siddham | Svenānubhavishyamāṇasya purushāntara-gatasya cha tathātvam anumāna-gamyam | Evaṁ tarhi bhāvi-janma-gata-sukhādikam api anumāna-gamyam iti chet | na | tadviśeshasya anavagamāt | Na khalu jyotishṭomādir ishṭaprāptihetuḥ kalañja-bhaxaṇa-varjanādir anishṭaparihāra-hetur ity amum artham veda-vyatirekeṇa anumāna-sahasreṇāpi tārkika-śiromaṇir apy asyāvagantuṁ śaknoti | Tasmād alaukikopāya-bodhako veda iti laxaṇasya nātivyāptaṁ | ata evoktam | 'Pratyaxeṇānumityā vā yas tūpāyo na budhyate | Etaṁ vindanti vedena tasmād vedasya vedatā' |*

iti | sa evopāyo vedasya vishayaḥ | tadbodha eva prayojanam | tadbodhārthī cha adhikārī | tena saha upakāryyopakāraka-bhāvaḥ sambandhaḥ | nanu evaṁ sati strī-śūdra-saṅkitāḥ sarve vedādhikārinaḥ syur ishṭam me syād anishṭam mā bhūd iti āśishaḥ sārvajanīnatvāt | maivam | strī-śūdrayoḥ saty upāye bodhārthitve hetvantareṇa vedādhikārasya pratibaddhatvāt | upanītasyaiva adhyayanādhikāram bruvat śāstram anupanītayoḥ strī-śūdrayor vedādhyayanam anishṭa-prāpti-hetur iti bodhayati | kathaṁ tarhi tayos tadupāyāvagamaḥ | purāṇādibhir iti brūmaḥ | ata evoktam | strī-śūdra-dvijabandhūnāṁ trayī na śrutigocharā | iti Bhāratam ākhyānam muninā kṛipayā kṛitam | iti | tasmād upanītair eva traivarṇikair vedasya sambandhaḥ | tatprāmāṇyantu bodhakatvāt svata eva siddham | paurusheya-vākyantu bodhakam api sat purusha-gata-bhrānti-mūlatva-sambhāvanayā tatparihārāya mūla-pramāṇam apexate na tu vedaḥ, tasya nityatvena vaktṛi-dosha-śaṅkānudayāt | . . . Nanu vedo 'pi Kālidāsādi-vākyavat paurusheya eva Brahma-kāryyatva-śravaṇāt | 'ṛichaḥ sāmāni jajñire | chhandāṁsi jajñire tasmād yajus tasmād ajāyata' iti śruteḥ | ata eva Bādarāyaṇaḥ 'śāstrayonitvād' iti sūtreṇa Brahmaṇo veda-kāraṇatvam avochat | maivam | śrutismṛitibhyāṁ nityatvāvagamāt | 'vāchā Virūpa nityayā' iti śruteḥ | 'anādi-nidhanā nityā vāg utsṛishṭā svayambhuvā' iti smṛiteścha | Bādarāyaṇo 'pi devatādhikaraṇe sūtrayāmāsa 'ata eva cha nityatvam' iti | tarhi paraspara-virodha iti chet | na | nityatvasya vyāvahārikatvāt sṛishṭer ūrdhvaṁ saṁhārāt pūrvam vyavahāra-kālas tasmin utpatti-vināśādarśanāt | kālākāśādayo yathā nityā evaṁ vedo 'pi vyavahāra-kāle Kālidāsādi-vākyavat purusha-virachitatvābhāvād nityaḥ | ādisṛishṭau tu kālākāśādivad eva Brahmaṇaḥ sakāśād vedotpattir āmnāyate | ato vishaya-bhedād na paraspara-virodhaḥ | Brahmaṇo nirdoshatvena vedasya vaktṛi-doshābhāvāt svatassiddham prāmāṇyaṁ tadavastham | tasmāl laxaṇa-pramāṇa-sadbhāvād vishaya-prayojana-sambandhādhikāri-sadbhāvāt prāmāṇyasya susthatvāchcha vedo vyākhatavya eva.

"Now, some may ask, what is this Veda, or what are its sub-

ject-matter, its use, its connection, or the persons who are competent to study it? and how is it authoritative? For, in the absence of all these conditions, the Veda does not deserve to be expounded. I reply: the book which makes known (*vedayati*) the supernatural (*lit.* non-secular) means of obtaining desirable objects, and getting rid of undesirable objects, is the Veda. By the employment of the word *supernatural*, [the two ordinary means of information, viz.] *perception* and *inference*, are excluded. By *perception* it is established that such things as garlands, sandal wood, and women are causes of gratification, and that the use of medicines and so forth is the means of getting rid of suffering. And we ascertain by *inference* that we shall in future experience, and that other men now experience, the same things. If it be asked whether, then, the happiness, etc., of a future birth be not in the same way ascertainable by inference, I reply that it is not, because we cannot get beyond generalities. Not even the most brilliant ornament of the logical school could, by a thousand inferences, without the help of the Vedas, discover the truths that the *jyotishṭhoma* and other sacrifices are the means of attaining happiness, and that abstinence from the flesh of an animal[33] struck with a poisoned arrow is the means of removing uneasiness. Thus it is not too wide a definition of the Veda to say that it is *that which indicates supernatural expedients*. Hence, it has been said, 'men discover by the Veda those expedients which cannot be ascertained by perception or inference; and this is the characteristic feature of the Veda.' These expedients, then, form the *subject* of the Veda; [to teach] the knowledge of them is its *use;* the person who seeks that knowledge is the *competent student;* and the *connection* of the Veda with such a student is that of a benefactor with the individual who is to be benefitted.

"But, if such be the case, it may be said that all persons

[33] The only other sense of the word *kalañja* in Boehtlingk and Roth's Lexicon is *tobacco*. It may be doubtful, however, if that weed was known in India when this commentary was written; and perhaps the illustration may be a traditional one, derived from an earlier age. See Müller in the Z. D. M. G. vii. pp. 376, 377.

whatever, including women and sūdras, must be competent students of the Veda, since the aspiration after good and the deprecation of evil are common to the whole of mankind. But it is not so. For though the expedient exists, and women and sūdras are desirous to know it, they are debarred by another cause from being competent students of the Veda. The scripture (*śāstra*) which declares that those persons only who have been invested with the sacrificial cord are competent to read the Veda, intimates thereby that the same study would be a cause of unhappiness to women and sūdras [who are not so invested]. How, then, are these two classes of persons to discover the means of future happiness? We answer, from the Puranas and other such works. Hence it has been said, 'since the triple Veda may not be heard by women, sūdras, and degraded twice-born men, the Mahābhārata was, in his benevolence, composed by the Muni.' The Veda, therefore, has only a relation to men of the three superior classes who have obtained investiture.

"Then the authority of the Veda is self-evident, from the fact of its communicating knowledge. For though the words of men also communicate knowledge, still, as they must be conceived to participate in the fallibility of their authors, they require some primary authority to remedy that fallibility. But such is not the case with the Veda; for as that had no beginning, it is impossible to suspect any defect in the utterer. . . .

"A doubt may, however, be raised whether the Veda is not, like the works of Kālidāsa and others, *derived from a personal being*,[34] as it is said in the Veda to have been formed by Brahma, according to the text, 'the Rik and Sāma verses, the metres sprang from him; from him the Yajush was produced;'[35] in consequence of which Bādarāyana, in the aphorism[36] 'since he is the source of the śāstra,' has pronounced that Brahma is the cause of the Veda.

[34] This seems to be the only way to translate *paurusheya*, as *purusha* cannot here mean a human being.

[35] R. V. x. 90, 9, quoted in the first Part of this work, pp. 7, 8.

[36] Brahma Sūtras, i. 1, 3, p. 7 of Dr. Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Vedānta.

But this doubt is groundless; for the eternity of the Veda has been declared both by itself, in the text, 'with an eternal voice, o Virūpa,'[37] and by the Smṛiti in the verse 'an eternal voice, without beginning or end, was uttered by the Self-existent.'[38] Bādarāyana, too, in his section on the deities (Brahma Sūtras, i. 3, 29) has this aphorism, 'hence also [its] eternity [is to be maintained].' If it be objected that these authorities are mutually conflicting, I answer, No. For [in the passages where] the word *eternity* is applied to the Vedas, it is to be understood as referring to the period of action [or mundane existence]. This period is that which commences with the creation, and lasts till the destruction of the universe, since, during this interval, no worlds are seen to originate, or to be destroyed. Just as time and ether (space) are eternal, so also is the Veda eternal, because, during the period of mundane existence, it has not been composed by any person, as the works of Kālidāsa and others have been.[39] Nevertheless, the Veda, like time and space, is

[37] These words are part of Rig-veda, viii. 64, 6:—*Tasmai nūnam abhidyave vāchā Virūpa nityayā | vṛishṇe chodasva sushṭutim.* "Send forth praises to this heaven-aspiring and prolific Agni, o Virūpa, with an unceasing voice [or hymn]." The word *nityayā* seems to mean nothing more than *continual*, though in the text I have rendered it *eternal*, as the author's reasoning seems to require. Colebrooke (Misc. Ess. i. 306), however, translates it by "*perpetual.*" I shall again quote and illustrate this verse further on.

[38] This line, from the M. Bh. S'āntip, 8,533, has been already cited above in p. 4. The Calcutta text, from which I have there quoted, gives *vidyā* instead of *nityā*, the reading of the Vedārtha-prakāśa in this passage. It is possible that the line may be found also in some of the Puranas.

[39] The same subject is touched on by Sāyana, at p. 20 of his commentary, in these words:—*Nanu bhagavatā Bādarāyaṇena Vedasya Brahma-kāryyatvaṁ sūtritam | 'śāstra-yonitvād' iti | ṛigvedādi-śāstra-kāraṇatvād Brahma sarvajñam iti sūtrārthaḥ | bāḍham | na etavatā paurusheyatvam bhavati | manushya-nirmitatvābhāvāt | īdṛiśam apaurusheyatvam abhipretya vyavahāra-daśāyām ākāśādi-vad nityatvam Bādarāyaṇenaiva devatādhikaraṇe sūtritam | 'ata evacha nityatvam' iti.* "But it is objected that the venerable Bādarāyana has declared in the aphorism 'since he is the source of the śāstra' (Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 3), that the Veda is derived from Brahma; the meaning of the aphorism being, that since Brahma is the cause of the Rig-veda and other S'āstras, he is omniscient. This is true; but it is not sufficient to prove the human origin of the Veda, since it was not formed by a man. Bādarāyana had in view such a superhuman origin of the Veda, when in the [other] aphorism 'hence also [its] eternity is to be maintained,' (which is contained in the section on the deities), he declared its eternity, like that of space, etc., during the period of mundane existence."

recorded in Scripture to have originated from Brahma at the first creation. There is, therefore, no discrepancy between the two different sets of passages, as they refer to different objects. And since Brahma is free from defect, the utterer of the Veda is consequently free from defect; and therefore a self-evinced authority resides in it. Seeing, therefore, that the Veda possesses a characteristic mark, and is supported by proof, and that it has a subject, a use, a relation, and persons competent for its study, and, moreover, that its authority is established, it follows that it ought to be interpreted."

SECT. VII.—*Arguments of the Mīmānsakas and Vedantins in support of the eternity and authority of the Vedas.*

I shall now proceed to adduce some of the reasonings by which the authors of the Pūrva Mīmānsā, and Vedānta aphorisms, and their commentators, defend the doctrine which, as we have already seen, is held by some of the Indian writers, that the Vedas are eternal, as well as infallible.

I. *Pūrva Mīmānsā.*—I quote the following texts of the Pūrva Mīmānsā which relate to this subject from Dr. Ballantyne's aphorisms of the Mīmānsā, pp. 8 ff. I do not always follow the words of Dr. Ballantyne's translations, though I have made free use of their substance. (See also Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 306, or p. 195 of W. and N's. edit.) The commentator introduces the subject in the following way:—*Śabdārthayor utpattyanantaram puruṣeṇa kalpita-saṅketātmaka-sambandhasya kalpitatvāt puruṣa-kalpita-sambandha-jñānāpexitvāt śabdāsya yathā prat-*

The remarks of S'ankara on the Brahma Sūtra (i. 1, 3) above referred to, begin as follows:—*Mahata ṛig-vedādeḥ śāstrasya aneka-vidyā-sthānopabṛiṁhitasya pradīpavat sarvārtha-dyotinas sarvajña-kalpasya yoniḥ kāraṇam Brahma | na hi īdṛiśasya śāstrasya ṛigvedādi-laxaṇasya sarvajña-guṇānvitasya sarvajñād anyataḥ sambhavo 'sti.* "Brahma is the source of a great S'āstra, consisting of the Rig-veda, etc., augmented by numerous branches of science, which, like a lamp, illuminates all subjects, and approaches to omniscience. Now such a S'āstra, distinguished as the Rig-veda, etc., possessed of the qualities of an omniscient being, could not have originated from any other than an omniscient being." See Dr. Ballantyne's Vedānta Aphorisms, pp. 7, 8.

yaxa-jñānaṁ śuktikādau satyatvam vyabhicharati tathā purushādhīnatvena śabde 'pi satyatva-vyabhichāra-sambhavāt na dharme chodanā pramāṇam iti pūrva-paxe siddhāntam āha. "Since, subsequently to the production of words and things, a conventional connection has been established between the two by the will of man, and since language is dependent upon a knowledge of this conventional connection determined by man, [it follows that] as *perception* is liable to error in respect of mother-of-pearl and similar objects [by mistaking them for silver], so words also may be open to convey unreal notions from [their sense] being dependant on human will; and consequently that the Vedic precepts [which are expressed in such words, possessing a merely conventional and arbitrary meaning] cannot be authoritative in matters of duty. Such is an objection which may be urged, and in reply to which the author of the aphorisms declares the established doctrine."

Then follows the fifth aphorism of the first chapter of the first book of the Mīmānsā:—*Autpattikastu*[a] *śabdasya*[b] *arthena sambandhas*[c] *tasya*[d] *jñānam*[e] *upadeśo*[f] *'vyatirekaścha*[g] *arthe 'nupalabdhe*[h] *tat*[i] *pramāṇam Bādarāyaṇasya anapexatvāt* | which may be paraphrased as follows:—"The connection of a word with its sense is coeval with the origin of both. In consequence of this connection the words of the Veda convey a knowledge of duty, and impart unerring instruction in regard to matters imperceptible. Such Vedic injunctions constitute the proof of duty admitted by Bādarāyana, author of the Vedānta Sūtras, for this proof is independent of perception and all other evidence."

I subjoin most of the remarks of the scholiast as given by Dr. Ballantyne, indicating by letters the words of the aphorism to which they refer.

[a] *Autpattikaḥ* | *svābhāvikaḥ* | *nitya iti yāvat* | "*Autpattika* (original) means natural, eternal in short.

[b] *Śabdasya* | *nitya-veda-ghaṭaka-padasya 'agnihotraṁ juhuyāt svarga-kāma' ityādeḥ.* "*Śabda* (word) refers to terms

which form part of the eternal veda, such as, 'the man who desires heaven should perform the Agnihotra sacrifice.'"

(c) *Sambandha* (connection) "in the nature of power," *i.e.* according to Dr. Ballantyne, depending on the divine will that such and such words should convey such and such meanings.

(d) *Atas tasya | dharmasya | "' Hence'* is to be supplied before '*this,*' which refers to 'duty.'"

(e) *Jñānam | atra karaṇe lyut | jñapter yathārtha-jñānasya karaṇam.* "In the word *jñana* (knowledge) the affix *lyut* has the force of 'instrument,' 'an instrument of correct knowledge.'"

(f) *Upadeśaḥ | artha-pratipādanam.* "Instruction, *i.e.* the establishment of a fact."

(g) *Avyatirekaḥ | avyabhichārī dṛiśyate ataḥ.* "'Unerring,' *i.e.* that which is seen not to deviate therefrom."

(h) *Nanu 'vahnimān' iti śabda-śravaṇānantaram pratyaxeṇa vahniṁ dṛishtvā śabde pramātvaṁ gṛihṇāti iti loke prasiddheḥ pratyaxādītara-pramāṇa-sāpexatvāt śabdasya sa kathaṁ dharme pramāṇam ata āha anupalabdhe iti | anupalabdhe pratyaxādi-pramāṇair ajñāte 'rthe.* "Since it is a matter of notoriety that any one who has heard the words '[the mountain is] fiery' uttered, and afterwards sees the fire with his own eyes, is *then* [more than ever] convinced of the authority of the words, it may be asked how words which are thus dependent [for confirmation] on perception and other proofs, can themselves constitute the proof of duty? In reference to this, the word *anupalabdhe* ('in regard to matters imperceptible') is introduced. It signifies 'matters which cannot be known by perception and other such proofs.'"

(i) *Tat | vidhi-ghaṭita-vākyaṁ dharme pramāṇam Bādarāyaṇ-āchāryasya sammatam | ayam āśayaḥ | 'parvato vahnimān' iti doshavat-purusha-prayuktam vākyam arthaṁ vyabhicharati | ataḥ prāmāṇya-niśchaye pratyaxādikam apexate | tathā 'gnihotraṁ juhoti iti vākyam kāla-traye 'py arthaṁ na vyabhicharati | ata itara-nirapexaṁ dharme pramāṇam.* "This, *i.e.* a [Vedic]

sentence consisting of an injunction, is regarded by Bādarāyana also as proof of duty. The purport is this. The sentence, 'the mountain is fiery,' when uttered by a person defective [in his organ of vision], may deviate from the reality; it therefore requires the evidence of our senses, etc., to aid us in determining its sufficiency as proof. Whereas the Vedic sentence regarding the performance of the Agnihotra sacrifice can never deviate from the truth in any time, past, present, or future; and is therefore a proof of duty, independently of any other evidence."

The commentator then proceeds to observe as follows:—*Pūrva-sūtre śabdārthayos sambandho nitya ity uktam | tachcha śabda-nityatvādhīnam iti tat sisādhayishur ādau śabdānityatva-vādi-matam pūrva-paxam upādayati.* "In the preceding aphorism it was declared that the connection of words and their meanings [or the things signified by them] is eternal. Desiring now to prove that this [eternity of connection] is dependent on the eternity of words [or sound], he begins by setting forth the first side of the question, viz., the doctrine of those who maintain that sound is not eternal."

This doctrine is accordingly declared in the six following aphorisms (*sūtras*), which I shall quote and paraphrase, without citing, in the original, the accompanying comments. These the reader will find in Dr. Ballantyne's work.

Sūtra 6.—*Karma eke tatra darśanāt.* "Some, *i.e.* the followers of the Nyāya philosophy, say that sound is a product, because we see that it is the result of effort, which it would not be if it were eternal."

Sūtra 7.—*Asthānāt.* "That it is not eternal, on account of its transitoriness, *i.e.* because, after a moment it ceases to be perceived."

Sūtra 8.—*Karoti-śabdāt.* "Because we employ in reference to it the expression *making*, *i.e.* we speak of *making* a sound."

Sūtra 9.—*Sattvāntare yaugapadyāt.* "Because it is per-

ceived by different persons at once, and is consequently in immediate contact with the organs of sense of those both far and near, which it could not be if it were one and eternal."

Sūtra 10.—*Prakṛiti-vikṛityoścha.* "Because sounds have both an original and a modified form; as, *e.g.* in the case of *dadhi atra,* which is changed into *dadhy atra,* the original letter *i* being altered into *y* by the rules of permutation. Now, no substance which undergoes a change is eternal."

Sūtra 11.—*Vṛiddhiścha kartṛi-bhūmnā 'sya.* "Because sound is augmented by the number of those who make it. Consequently the opinion of the Mīmānsakas, who say that sound is merely *manifested,* and not *created,* by human effort, is wrong, since even a thousand *manifesters* do not increase the object which they *manifest,* as a jar is not made larger by a thousand lamps."

These objections against the Mīmānsaka theory that sound is manifested, and not created, by those who utter it, are controverted in the following Sūtras:—

Sūtra 12.—*Samañ tu tatra darśanam.* "But, according to both schools, viz., that which holds sound to be *created,* and that which regards it as merely *manifested,* the perception of it is alike momentary. But of these two views, the theory of manifestation is shown in the next aphorism to be the correct one."

Sūtra 13.—*Sataḥ param adarśanañ vishayānāgamat.* "The non-perception, at any particular time, of sound, which, in reality, perpetually exists, arises from the fact that the utterer of sound has not come into contact with his object, *i.e.* sound. Sound is eternal, because we recognise the letter *k,* for instance, to be the same sound which we have always heard, and because it is the simplest method of accounting for the phenomenon to suppose that it is the same. The still atmosphere which interferes with the perception of sound, is removed by the conjunctions and disjunctions of air issuing from a speaker's mouth, and thus sound (which always exists, though unperceived) becomes

perceptible.[40] This is the reply to the objection of its 'transitoriness' (Sūtra 7)."

An answer to Sūtra 8 is given in

Sūtra 14.—*Prayogasya param.* "The word '*making*' sounds, merely means employing or uttering them."

The objection made in Sūtra 9 is answered in

Sūtra 15.—*Āditya-vad yaugayadyam.* "One sound is simultaneously heard by different persons, just as one sun is seen by them at one and the same time. Sound, like the sun, is a vast, and not a minute object, and thus may be perceptible by different persons, though remote from one another."

An answer to Sūtra 10 is contained in

Sūtra 16.—*Varṇāntaram avikāraḥ.* "The letter *y*, which is substituted for *i* in the instance referred to under Sūtra 10, is not a modification of *i*, but a distinct letter. Consequently sound is not modified."

The 11th Sūtra is answered in

Sūtra 17.—*Nāda-vṛiddhiḥ parā.* "It is an increase of *noise*, not of *sound*, that is occasioned by a multitude of speakers. The word *noise* refers to the 'conjunctions and disjunctions of the air' (mentioned under Sūtra 13), which enter simultaneously into the hearer's ear from different quarters; and it is of these that an increase takes place."

The next following Sūtras state the reasons which support the Mīmānsaka view:—

Sūtra 18.—*Nityastu syād darśanasya parārthatvāt.* "Sound must be eternal, because its utterance is intended to convey a meaning to other persons. If it were not eternal [or abiding], it would not continue till the hearer had learned its sense, and thus he would not learn the sense, because the cause had ceased to exist."

[40] "Sound is unobserved, though existent, if it reach not the object (vibrations of air emitted from the mouth of the speaker proceed and manifest sound by their appulse to air at rest in the space bounded by the hollow of the ear; for want of such appulse, sound, though existent, is unapprehended)."—Colebrooke i. 306.

Sūtra 19.—*Sarvatra yaugapadyāt.* "Sound is eternal, because it is in every case correctly understood by many persons simultaneously; and it is inconceivable that they should all at once fall into a mistake."

When the word *go* (cow) has been repeated ten times, the hearers will say that the word *go* has been ten times pronounced, not that ten words having the sound of *go* have been uttered; and this fact also is adduced as a proof of the eternity of sound in

Sūtra 20.—*Saṅkhyābhāvāt.* "Because each sound is not numerically different from itself repeated."

Sūtra 21.—*Anapexatvāt.* "Sound is eternal, because we have no ground for anticipating its destruction."

"But it may be urged that sound is a modification of air, since it arises from its conjunctions (see Sūtra 17), and because the *Śikshā* (or Vedānga treating of pronunciation) says that 'air arrives at the condition of sound;' and as it is thus produced from air, it cannot be eternal." A reply to this difficulty is given in

Sūtra 22.—*Prakhyābhāvāchcha yogyasya.* "Sound is not a modification of air, because, if it were, the organ of hearing would have no appropriate object which it could perceive. No modification of air (held by the Naiyāyikas to be *tangible*) could be perceived by the organ of hearing, which deals only with intangible sound."

Sūtra 23.—*Liṅga-darśanāchcha.* "And the eternity of sound is established by the argument discoverable in the Vedic text, 'with an eternal voice, o Virūpa.' (See above, p. 51). Now, though this sentence had another object in view, it, nevertheless, repeats the eternity of language, and hence sound is eternal."

"But though words, as well as the connection of word and sense, be eternal, it may be objected—as in the following aphorism—that a command conveyed in the form of a *sentence* is no proof of duty."

Sūtra 24.—*Utpattau vā rachanāḥ syur arthasya atannimittatvāt.* "Though there be a natural connection between *words*

and their meanings, the connection between *sentences* and their meanings is a factitious one, established by human will, from these meanings (of the sentences) not arising out of the meanings of the words. The connection of sentences with their meanings is not (like the connection of words with their meanings) one derived from inherent *power* (see Sūtra 5, remark (c), above, p. 54), but one devised by men; how, then, can this connection afford a sufficient authority for duty?"

An answer to this is given in

Sūtra 25.—*Tad-bhūtānāṁ kriyārthena samāmnāyo 'rthasya tannimittatvāt.* "The various terms which occur in every Vedic precept are accompanied by a verb, because a perception (such as we had not before) of the sense of a sentence is derived from a collection of words involving a verb. For a precept is not comprehended unless the individual words which make it up are understood; and the comprehension of the meaning of a sentence is nothing else than the comprehension of the exact mutual relation of the meanings arising out of each word."

Sūtra 26. — *Loke sanniyamāt prayoga-sannikarshaḥ syāt.* "As in secular language the application of words is fixed, so also in the Veda they must be employed in an established sense which has been handed down by tradition."

The author now proceeds in the next following Sūtras to state and to obviate certain objections raised to his dogmas of the eternity and authority of the Vedas.

Sūtra 27. — *Vedāṁśchaike sannikarsham purushākhyāḥ.* "Some (the followers of the Nyāya) declare the Vedas to be of recent origin, *i.e.* not eternal, because the names of men are applied to certain parts of them, as the Kāṭhaka and Kauthuma."

This Sūtra, with some of those which follow, is quoted in Sāyana's commentary on the R. V. vol. i. pp. 19 and 20. His explanation of the present Sūtra is as follows:—

Yathā Raghuvaṁśādaya idānīntanās tathā vedā api | na tu vedā anādayaḥ | ata eva veda-kartṛitvena purushā ākhyāyante | Vaiyāsikam Bhāratam Vālmīkīyaṁ Rāmāyaṇam ity atra yathā

Bhāratādi-kartṛitvena Vyāsādaya ākhyāyante tathā Kāṭhakāṁ Kauthumaṁ Taittirīyakam ity evaṁ tattad-veda-śākhā-karttṛitvena Kaṭhādīnām ākhyātatvāt paurusheyāḥ | Nanu nityānām eva vedānām upādhyāya-vat sampradāya-pravarttakatvena Kāṭhakādi-sāmākhyā syād ity āśaṇkya yuktyantaraṁ sūtrayati | . . . . kā tarhi Kāṭhakādyākhyāyikāyā gatir ity āśaṇkya sampradāya-pravarttanāt sā iyam upapadyate. "Some say, that as the Raghuvanśa, etc., are modern, so also are the Vedas, and that the Vedas are not eternal. Accordingly, certain men are named as the authors of the Vedas. Just as in the case of the Mahābhāratā, which is called *Vaiyāsika* (composed by Vyāsa), and the Rāmāyana, which is called *Vālmīkīya* (composed by Vālmīki), Vyāsa and Vālmīki are indicated as the authors of these poems; so, too, Katha, Kuthumi, and Tittiri are shown to be the authors of those particular Śākhās of the Vedas which bear their names, viz., the *Kāṭhaka, Kauthuma,* and *Taittirīya;* and consequently those parts of the Vedas are of human origin. In answer to this it is suggested that the Vedas, though eternal, have received the name of *Kāṭhaka,* etc., because Katha and others, as teachers, handed them down."

This interpretation is accepted a little further on, in the remarks on one of the following Sūtras:—"What, then, is the fact in reference to the appellations *Kāṭhaka,* etc.? It is proved to have arisen from the circumstance that Katha, etc., handed down the Vedas."

Sūtra 28.—*Anitya-darśanāchcha.* "It is also objected that the Vedas cannot be eternal, because we observe that persons, who are not eternal, but subject to birth and death, are mentioned in them. Thus it is said in the Veda 'Babara Prāvahani desired,' 'Kusurubinda Auddālaki desired.' Now, as the words of the Veda in which they are mentioned could not have existed before these persons were born, it is clear that these words had a beginning, and being thus non-eternal, they are proved to be of human origin." (*'Babaraḥ Prāvahaṇir akāmayata' 'Kusuruvinda Auddālakir akāmayata' ityādi vedeshu darśanāt teshāṁ*

jananāt prāg imāni vākyāni nāsann iti sāditvād anityatvam paurusheyatvañcha siddham.)

These objections are answered in the following aphorisms :—

Sūtra 29.—*Uktantu śabda-pūrvatvam.* "But the priority—eternity—of sound has been declared, and, by consequence, the eternity of the Veda."

Sūtra 30.—*Ākhyā pravachanāt.* "The names derived from those of particular men, attached to certain parts of the Vedas, were given on account of their studying those particular parts. Thus the portion read by Katha was called *Kāṭhaka*, etc."

Sūtra 31.—*Parantu śrutiḥ sāmānyam.* "And names *occurring in* the Veda, which appear to be those of men, are appellations common to other beings besides men."

"Thus the words *Babara Prāvahaṇi* are not the names of a man, but have another meaning. For the particle *pra* denotes 'pre-eminence,' *vahana* means 'motion,' and the letter *i* represents the agent; consequently the word *prāvahaṇi* signifies that *which moves swiftly*, and is applied to the wind, which is eternal. *Babara* again is a word imitating the sound of the wind. Thus there is not even a semblance of error in the assertion that the Veda is eternal." (*Yadyapi Babaraḥ Prāvahaṇir ity asti parantu śrutiḥ prāvaḥaṇyādi-śabdaḥ sāmānyam | anyārthasyāpi vāchakam | tathā hi | 'pra' ityasya utkarshāśrayaḥ | 'vahana' śabdasya gatiḥ | ikāraḥ karttā | tathā cha utkṛishṭa-gatyāśrayo vāyu-paraḥ | sa cha anādiḥ | Babara iti vāyu-śabdānukaraṇam iti na anupapatti-gandho 'pi.*)

Before proceeding to the 32nd Sūtra, I shall quote some further illustrations of the 31st, which are to be found in certain passages of the Introduction to Sāyana's Commentary on the Rig-veda, where he is explaining another section of the Mīmānsā Sūtras. The passages are as follows (p. 7) :—

Anitya-saṁyogad mantrānarthakyam | 'kiṁ te kṛiṇvanti kīkaṭeshv' iti mantre kīkaṭo nāma janapada āmnātaḥ | Tathā naichaśākhaṁ nāma nagaram pramagando nāma rājā ity ete 'rthā anityā āmnātāḥ | Tathā cha sati prāk pramagandād na ayam

mantro bhūta-pūrva iti gamyate. And in p. 10 :—*Yad apy uktam pramagandādy-anityārtha-saṁyogād mantrasya anāditvaṁ na syād iti tatrottaram sūtrayati | Uktaś chānitya-saṁyoga iti | prathama-pādasya antimādhikaraṇe so 'yam anitya saṁyoga-dosha uktaḥ parihṛitaḥ | Tathā hi | tatra pūrva-paxe Vedānām paurusheyatvaṁ vaktuṁ kāṭhakaṁ kālāpakam ity ādi purusha-sambandhābhidhānaṁ hetūkṛitya 'anityadarśanāchcha' iti hetvantaraṁ sūtritam | 'Babaraḥ prāvahaṇir akāmayata' ity anityānām Babarādīnām arthānāṁ darśanāt tataḥ pūrvam asattvāt paurusheyo veda iti tasya uttaraṁ sūtritam 'paraṁ tu śruti-sāmānya-mātram' iti | tasya ayam arthaḥ | yat kāṭhakādi-samākhyānaṁ tat pravachana-nimittam | yat tu param Babarādyanitya-darśanaṁ tat śabda-sāmānya-mātraṁ na tu tatra Babarākhyaḥ kaśchit purusho vivaxitaḥ | kintu 'babara' iti śabdaṁ kurvan vāyur abhidhīyate | sacha prāvahaṇiḥ | prakarsheṇa vahana-śīlaḥ | Evam anyatrāpy ūhaniyam.* "It is objected that the mantras are useless, because they are connected with temporal objects. Thus in the text, 'what are thy cows doing among the Kīkatas?' (see Part Second, p. 362), a country called Kīkata is mentioned, as well as a city named Naichaśākha, and a king called Pramaganda, all of them non-eternal objects. Such being the case, it is clear that this text did not exist before Pramaganda." The answer to this is given in p. 10. "To the further objection that the mantras cannot be eternal, because such temporal objects as Pramaganda, etc., are referred to in them, an answer is given in the following Sūtra :—'The connection with non-eternal objects has been already explained.' In the last section of the first book, this very objection of the hymns being connected with non-eternal things has been stated and obviated (see above, Sūtras 28-31). For in the statement of objections, after it has first been suggested as a proof of the human origin of the Vedas, that they bear names, Kāthaka, Kālāpaka, etc., denoting their relation to men, a further difficulty is stated in a Sūtra, viz., that 'it is noticed that non-eternal objects are mentioned in the Vedas;' as, for example,

where it is said that 'Babara Prāvahani desired.' Now, as it specifies non-eternal objects of this kind, the Veda, which could not have existed before those objects, must be of human origin. The answer to this is given in the aphorism, 'any further names are to be understood as common to other things.' The meaning is this: the names *Kāthaka*, etc., are given to the Vedas because they were expounded by Katha, etc.; and the further difficulty arising from the names of Babara and other objects supposed to be non-eternal, is removed by such names being common to other objects [which are eternal in their nature]. No persons called *Babara*, etc., are intended by those names, for *babara* is an imitation of a sound. Hence it designates the wind, which makes the sound *babara*. And *prāvahaṇi* refers to the same object, as it means that which *moves swiftly*. The same method of explanation is to be applied in other similar cases."

I proceed to the 32nd Sūtra. It is asked how the Veda can constitute proof of duty when it contains such incoherent nonsense as the following: "Jaradgava, in blanket slippers, is standing at the door and singing benedictions. A Brahman female, desirous of offspring, asks, 'Pray, sir, what is the meaning of intercourse on the day of the new moon?' or the following: 'the cows attended this sacrifice.'" A reply is contained in

Sūtra 32.—*Kṛite vā viniyogaḥ syāt karmaṇaḥ sambandhāt.* "The expressions to which objection is taken may be applicable to the duty to be performed, from the relation in which they stand to the ceremony."

As a different reading and interpretation of this Sūtra are given by Sāyana in his Commentary, p. 20, I shall quote it, and the remarks with which he introduces and follows it.

Nanu vede kvachid evaṁ śrūyate 'vanaspatayaḥ satram āsata sarpāḥ satram āsata' iti | tatra vanaspatīnām achetanatvāt sarpāṇāṁ chetanatve 'pi vidyārahitatvād na tad-anushṭhānaṁ sambhavati | Ato 'Jaradgavo gāyati madrakāṇi' ityādy-unmatta-bāla-vākya-sadṛiśatvāt kenachit kṛito veda ity āśaṅkya uttaraṁ

sūtrayati | 'Kṛite cha aviniyogaḥ syāt karmaṇaḥ samatvāt' | Yadi jyotishṭomādi-vākyaṁ kenachit purusheṇa kriyeta tadānīṁ kṛite tasmin vākye svarga-sādhanatve jyotishṭomasya viniyogaḥ na syāt | sādhya-sādhana-bhāvasya purusheṇa jñātum aśakyatvāt | śrūyate tu viniyogaḥ | 'jyotishṭomena svarga-kāmo yajeta' iti | na cha etat unmatta-vākya-sadriśaṁ laukika-vidhi-vākya-vad bhāvya-karaṇeti-kartavyatā-rūpais tribhir aṁśair upetāyā bhāvanāyā avagamāt | loke hi 'brāhmaṇān bhojayed' iti vidhau kiṁ kena katham ity ākāṇxāyāṁ tṛiptim uddiśya odanena dravyeṇa śāka-sūpādi-pariveshaṇa-prakāreṇa iti yathochyate | jyotishṭoma-vidhāv api svargam uddiśya somena dravyeṇa dīxaṇīyādy-aṇgopakāra-prakāreṇa ityukte katham unmatta-vākya-sadriśaṁ bhaved iti | vanaspatyādi-satra-vākyam api na tat-sadriśaṁ tasya satra-karmaṇo jyotishṭomādinā samatvāt | yat-paro hi śabdaḥ sa śabdārtha iti nyāya-vida āhuḥ | jyotishṭomādi-vākyasya vidhāyakatvād anushṭhāne tātparyyam | vanaspatyādi-satra-vākyasya arthavādatvād praśaṁsāyāṁ tatparyam | sā cha avidyamānenāpi karttuṁ śakyate | achetanā avidvāṁso 'pi satram anushṭhitavantaḥ kim punaś chetanā vidvāṁso brāhmaṇā iti satra-stutiḥ. "But it will be objected that the Veda contains such sentences as this—'trees and serpents attended at the sacrifice.' Now, since trees are insensible, and serpents, though possessing sensibility, are destitute of knowledge, it is inconceivable that either the one or the other should assist at the ceremony. Hence, from its resembling the silly talk of madmen and children, as where it says, 'Jaradgava sings songs fit only for the Madras' (see Part Second, pp. 481 ff.), the Veda must have been composed by some man. The answer to this doubt is contained in the following Sūtra (which I can only render by a paraphrase): — 'If prescribed by mere human authority, no rite can have any efficacy; but such ceremonies as the jyotishtoma rest on the authority of the Veda; and texts such as that regarding the *trees* and *serpents* have the same intention, *i.e.* to commend sacrifice.' If the sentence enjoining the *jyotishtoma* sacrifice had been composed by any man, that

sacrifice, enjoined by such an authority, would not have been applicable as a means of attaining paradise; for no man can know what is the means of accomplishing such an end. But the application in question is prescribed *in the Veda* by the words 'let him who seeks paradise, sacrifice with the *jyotishtoma*.' Now this injunction does not resemble the talk of a madman, since we recognize in it, as in injunctions of a secular kind, the contemplation of the three necessary modes of the action to be performed. For, as when a question is put in regard to the *object* for which, the *instrument* through which, and the *manner* in which the secular precept, 'to feed Brahmans,' is to be fulfilled,—we are told that the object is to be their *satisfaction*, the instrumental substance *boiled rice*, and the manner *that it is to be served up with vegetables and condiments;* in the same way, in the Vedic injunction regarding the *jyotishtoma*, we are told that *paradise* is the object, that *soma* is the instrumental substance, and that the application of *the introductory and other portions of the ritual* is the manner. And when this is so, how can this precept be compared to the talk of a madman? Nor does the sentence regarding *trees, etc., attending at a sacrifice* admit of such a comparison, since the sacrifice in question is similarly circumstanced with the *jyotishtoma*. For the logicians say that the meaning of a word is *the sense which it is intended to intimate*. The purport of the sentence regarding the *jyotishtoma*, which is of a *preceptive* character, is to command performance. The object of the sentence regarding *trees, etc., attending at a sacrifice*, which is of a narrative character, is *eulogy;* and this can be offered even by an insensible [?] object. The sacrifice is eulogized by saying that it was celebrated *even by insensible trees and ignorant serpents: how much more, then, by Brahmans possessed both of sensation and knowledge!*"

II.—*The Vedānta*.—I proceed to adduce the reasonings by which Bādarāyana, the author of the Brahma, Vedānta, or Śārīraka Sūtras, as expounded by Śankara Āchāryya in his

Śārīraka-mīmāṁsā-bhāshya, or commentary on those Sūtras, corroborates the arguments of Jaimini in regard to the eternity and consequent authority of the Veda. After discussing the question whether any persons but Hindus of the three highest tribes are qualified for divine knowledge, the author of the Sūtras comes to the conclusion that Śūdras, or persons of the fourth tribe, are incompetent, while beings superior to man, the gods, are competent (Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 348, or p. 223 of W. and N.'s ed.) In Sūtra i. 3, 26, the author determines that the gods have a *desire* for final emancipation, owing to the instability of their power, and a *capacity* for acquiring a knowledge of Brahma, because they are *corporeal* beings; and that there is no obstacle which prevents their attaining such divine knowledge. A difficulty, however, having been raised that the gods cannot be corporeal, because, if they were so, it is necessary to conceive that they would be corporeally present at, and form (as priests actually do) a part of the ceremonial of, sacrifice, which would not consist with the usual course of such ceremonies, at which the gods are not seen to be corporeally present, and would, in fact, involve an impossibility, since Indra, for example, being but one, could not be corporeally present at numerous sacrifices at once;—this difficulty is solved (under Sūtra i. 3, 27) in two ways, either by supposing (1) that the gods assume different forms, and are present at many sacrifices at once, though invisible to mortals; or by considering (2) that, as a sacrifice is offered *to* a deity, many persons may present their oblations to that deity at once, just as one Brahman may be saluted by many different persons at the same time. It is, therefore, concluded that the corporeal nature of the gods is not inconsistent with the practice of sacrifice. Having settled these points, Śankara comes to Sūtra i. 3, 28.

'*Śabda iti chet | na | ataḥ prabhavāt | pratyaxānumānābhyām.*'

Mā nāma vigrahavattve devādīnām abhyupagamyamāne karmaṇi kaśchid virodhaḥ prasañji | śabde tu virodhaḥ prasajyeta |

katham | 'Autpattikaṁ hi śabdasya arthena sambandham'āśritya 'anapexatvād' iti vedasya prāmāṇyaṁ sthāpitam | Idānīntu vigrahavatī devatā 'bhyupagamyamānā yadyapy aiśvaryya-yogād yugapad aneka-karma-sambandhīni havīṁshi bhuñjīta tathāpi vigraha-yogād asmadādi-vaj janana-maraṇavatī sā iti nityasya śabdasya anityena arthena nitya-sambandhe pralīyamāne yad vaidike śabde prāmāṇyaṁ sthitaṁ tasya virodhaḥ syād iti chet | na ayam apy asti virodhaḥ | kasmād 'ataḥ prabhavāt' | Ata eva hi vaidikāt śabdād devādikaṁ jagat prabhavati | Nanu 'janmādi asya yataḥ' (Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 2) *iti brahma-prabhavatvaṁ jagato 'vadhāritaṁ katham iha śabda-prabhavatvam uchyate | Apicha yadi nāma vaidikāt śabdād asya prabhavo 'bhyupagataḥ katham etāvatā virodhaḥ śabde parihṛitaḥ | yāvatā Vasavo Rudrā Ādityā Viśvedevā Maruta ity ete 'rthā anityā eva utpattimattvāt | Tad-anityatve cha tad-vāchakānaṁ vaidikānāṁ Vasvādi-śabdānām anityatvaṁ kena vāryyate | Prasiddhaṁ hi loke Devadattasya putre utpanne Yajñadatta iti tasya nāma kriyate iti | Tasmād virodha eva śabde iti chet | na | Gavādi-śabdārthasambandha-nityatva-darśanāt | Na hi gavādi-vyaktīnām utpattimattve tad-ākṛitīnām apy utpattimattvaṁ syād dravya-guṇa-karmaṇāṁ hi vyaktaya eva utpadyante na ākṛitayaḥ | Ākṛitibhiścha śabdānāṁ sambandho na vyaktibhiḥ | vyaktīnām ānantyāt sambandha-grahaṇānupapatteḥ | Vyaktishu utpadyamānāsvapy ākṛitīnāṁ nityatvād na gavādi-śabdeshu kaśchid virodho dṛiśyate | Tathā devādi-vyakti-prabhavābhyupagame 'pi ākṛiti-nityatvād na kaśchid Vasv-ādi-śabdeshu virodha iti drashṭavyam | Ākṛiti-viśeshas tu devādīnām mantrārthavādādibhyo vigrahavattvādy-avagamād avagantavyaḥ | Sthāna-viśesha-sambandha-nimittāścha Indrādi-śabdāḥ senāpatyādi-śabda-vat | Tataścha yo yas tat tat sthānam adhitishṭhati sa sa Indrādi-śabdair abhidhīyate iti na dosho bhavati | Na cha idaṁ śabda-prabhavatvam Brahma-prabhavatva-vad upādāna-kāraṇatvābhiprāyeṇa uchyate | kathaṁ tarhi sthiti-vāchakātmanā nitye śabde nityārtha-sambandhini śabda-vyavāhāra-yogyārtha-vyakti-nishpattir 'ataḥ prabhava' ity uchyate | katham punar avagamyate śabdāt prabhavati jagad*

iti | 'pratyaxānumānābhyām' | Pratyaxaṁ śrutiḥ | prāmāṉyam prati anapexatvāt | anumānaṁ smṛitiḥ | prāmāṉyam prati sāpexatvāt | Te hi śabda-pūrvāṁ sṛishtiṁ darśayataḥ | 'Eta' iti vai prajāpatir devān asṛijata 'asṛigram' iti manushyān 'indava' iti pitṛīṁs 'tiraḥ pavitram' iti grahān 'āśava' iti stotraṁ 'viśvāni' iti śastram 'abhi saubhagā' ity anyāḥ prajā iti śrutiḥ | Tathā 'nyatrāpi 'sa manasā vācham mithunaṁ samabhavad' ityādinā tatra tatra śabda-pūrvikā sṛishtiḥ śrāvyate | Smṛitir api 'anādi-nidhanā nityā vāg utsṛishṭa svayambhuvā | ādau vedamayī divyā yataḥ sarvāḥ pravṛittayaḥ' ity utsargo 'py ayaṁ vāchaḥ sampradāya-pravarttanātmako drashṭavyaḥ anādi-nidhanāyāḥ anyādṛiśasya utsargasya asambhavāt | Tathā 'nāma-rūpañcha bhūtānāṁ karmaṇāñcha pravarttanam | Veda-śabdebhya evādau nirmame sa maheśvaraḥ' iti | 'sarveshāñcha sa nāmāni karmāṉi cha pṛithak pṛithak | Veda-śabdebhya evādau pṛithak saṁsthāścha nirmame' iti cha | Apicha chikīrshitam artham anutishṭhan tasya vāchakaṁ śabdam pūrvaṁ smṛitvā paśchāt tam artham anutishṭhati iti sarveshāṁ naḥ pratyaxam etat | Tathā prajāpater api srashṭuḥ sṛishteḥ pūrvaṁ vaidikāḥ śabdā manasi prādurbabhūvuḥ paśchāt tad-anugatān arthān sasarjja iti gamyate | Tathā cha śrutiḥ 'sa bhūr iti vyāharan bhūmim asṛijata' ityevamādikā bhūrādi-śabdebhya eva manasi prādurbhūtebhyo bhūr-ādi-lokān prādurbhūtān sṛishṭān darśayati | kimātmakam punaḥ śabdam abhipretya idaṁ śabda-prabhavatvam uchyate | sphoṭam ityāha | . . . Tasmād nityāt śabdāt sphoṭa-rūpād abhidhāyakāt kriyā-kāraka-phala-laxanaṁ jagad abhidheya-bhūtam prabhavatīti | . . . Tataścha nityebhyaḥ śabdebhyo devādi-vyaktīnām prabhava ity aviruddham.

Sūtra i. 3, 29. *'Ata eva cha nityatvam' | svatantrasya karttuḥ smaraṇād eva hi sthite vedasya nityatve devādi-vyakti-prabhavābhyupagamena tasya virodham āśaṅkya 'ataḥ prabhavād' iti parihṛitya idānīṁ tad eva veda-nityatvaṁ sthitaṁ draḍhayati 'ata eva cha nityatvam' iti | ata eva cha niyatākṛiter devāder jagato veda-śabda-prabhavatvād eva veda-śabda-nityatvam api pratyetavyam | Tathā cha mantra-varnaḥ 'yajñena*

vāchaḥ padavīyam āyan tām anvavindann ṛishishu pravishṭām' iti sthitām eva vācham anuvinnāṁ darśayati | Vedavyāsaścha evam eva smarati | 'yugānte 'ntarhitān vedān setihāsān maharshayaḥ | lebhire tapasā pūrvam anujñātāḥ svayambhuvā' iti.

"Sūtra i. 3, 28:—'But it is said that there will be a contradiction in respect of sound (or the word); but this is not so, because the gods are produced from it, as is proved by intuition and inference.'

"Be it so, that though the corporeality of the gods, etc., be admitted, no contradiction will arise in respect of the ceremonial. Still [it will be said that] a contradiction will arise in regard to the *word*. How? [In this way.] By founding upon the 'inherent connection of a word with the thing signified,' the authority of the Veda had been established by the aphorism '*anapexatvāt*,' etc. (Mīmānsā Sūtras i. 2, 21; see above, p. 58.) But now, since it has been asserted that the deities are corporeal, it will follow that (though from their possession of divine power they can at one and the same time partake of the oblations offered at numerous sacrifices), they will still, owing to their corporeality, be subject, like ourselves, to birth and death; and hence, the eternal connection of the eternal word with an object which is non-eternal being lost, a contradiction will arise in regard to the authority proved to belong to the word of the Veda; [for thus the word, not having any eternal connection with the non-eternal thing, could not be eternal, and not being eternal, could not be authoritative]. But this supposed contradiction has no existence. How? 'Because they are produced from it.' Hence the world of gods, etc., is produced from the Vedic word. But according to the aphorism (Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 2) 'from him the production, etc., of all this is derived,' it is established that the world has been produced from Brahma. How, then, is it said here that it is produced from the word? And, moreover, if it be allowed that the world is produced from the Vedic word, how is the contradiction in regard to the word thereby removed, inasmuch as all the following classes of beings, viz., the Vasus, Rudras,

Ādityas, Viśvedevas, Maruts, are non-eternal, because produced; and when they are non-eternal, what is there to bar the non-eternity of the Vedic words *Vasu*, etc., by which they are designated? For it is a common saying, '*When a son is born to Devadatta, that son receives the name of Yajnadatta*,' [*i.e.* no child receives a name before it exists]. Hence a contradiction does arise in regard to [the eternity of] the word. To this objection we reply with a negative; for in the case of such words as *cow* we discover an eternal connection between the word and the thing. For although *individual cows*, etc., *come into* existence, the species to which they belong does not *begin to exist*, as it is individual substances, qualities, and acts, which begin to exist, and not their species. Now it is with species that words are connected, and not with individuals, for as the latter are infinite, such a connection would in their case be impossible. But as species are eternal (though individuals begin to exist) no contradiction is discoverable in the case of such words as *cow*, etc. In the same way it is to be remarked that though we allow that the individual gods, etc., have commenced to exist, there is no contradiction [to the eternity of the Vedic word] in the [existence of the] words *Vasu*, etc. [which denote those individual gods], since species are eternal. And the fact that the gods, etc., belong to particular species may be learned from this, that we discover their corporeality and other attributes in the hymns and *arthavādas* (explanatory remarks in the Vedas), etc. The words *Indra*, etc., are derived from connection with some particular post, like the words 'commander' (*senapāti*), etc. Hence, whosoever occupies any particular post, is designated by the words Indra, and so forth; and therefore Indra and the other gods belong to the species of occupants of particular posts. Thus there is no difficulty. And this derivation from the word is not, like production from Brahma, meant in the sense of evolution from a material cause. How, then (since language is eternal and connected with eternal objects), is it declared in the phrase 'produced from it' that the *production* of

individual beings, in the ordinary sense of the expression, is effected by a thing (sound or language), the very nature of which it is to denote *continuance* [and not such *change* as is involved in the idea of production?] How, again, is it known that the world is produced from the word? The answer is, [it is known] 'from intuition and inference.' 'Intuition' means the Veda, because it is independent of any (other) authority. 'Inference' means the smriti, because it is dependent on another authority (the Veda). These two demonstrate that the creation was preceded by the word. Thus the Veda says, 'at (or with) the word *ete* (*these*) Prajāpati created the gods; at *asṛigram* (*they were poured out*) he created men; at *indavaḥ* (*drops of soma*) he created the *pitris;* at *tiraḥ pavitram* (*through the filter*) he created the planets; at *āśavaḥ* (*swift*) he created hymns; at *viśvāni* (*all*) he created praise; and at the words *abhi saubhagā* (*for the sake of blessings*) he created the other creatures.'[41] And in another place it is said 'with his mind he produced speech, [as] *a mate*.' (Vrih. Ar. Up. p. 50.) By these and other such texts the Veda declares that creation was preceded by the word. And when the Smriti says, 'At first a divine voice, eternal, without beginning or end, formed of the Vedas, was uttered by Svayambhū, from which all activities [proceeded]' (see above, p. 4, note 2), the expression *utterance* of the voice is to be regarded as employed out of deference to the customary phraseology, since it is inconceivable that a voice which was 'without beginning or end,' could be uttered in the same sense as other sounds. Again, we have this other text, 'In the beginning Maheśvara created from the words of the Veda the names and forms of creatures, and their several modes of action;'

[41] I am unable to say whence this passage is derived; but it seems to be a mystical exposition, from a Brahmana or Upanishad, of the words from Rig-veda ix. 62, 1 (= Sāma-veda ii. 180), which are imbedded in it, viz., *ete asṛigram indavas tiraḥ pavitram āśavaḥ | viśvāni abhi saubhagā*. "These hurrying drops of soma have been poured through the filter, to procure all blessings." (See Benfey's translation.) It was by the help of Dr. Pertsch's alphabetical list of the initial words of the verses of the Rig-veda (in Weber's Ind. Stud.) that I discovered the verse in question in the R. V.

and again, 'He created in the beginning the several names, functions, and conditions of all creatures from the words of the Veda.' (See above, p. 4, note 2.) And it is a matter of common observation to us all, that when any one is occupied with any end which he wishes to accomplish, he first calls to mind the word which expresses it, and then proceeds to effect his purpose. So, too, in the case of Prajāpati the creator, we conclude that before the creation the words of the Veda were manifested in his mind, and that afterwards he created the objects which resulted from them. Thus the Vedic text which says, 'uttering *bhūr*, he created the earth (*bhūmi*), etc.,' intimates that the different worlds, earth and the rest, were manifested, *i.e.* created from the words *bhūr*, etc., manifested in his mind. Of what sort, now, was this word which is intended, when it is said that the world was produced from the word? It was *sphoṭa* (*disclosure* or *expression*), we are told."

I shall not quote the long discussion (extending over two quarto pages) on which Śankara here enters, regarding this term. (See Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 305, ff.; Ballantyne's Christianity Contrasted with Hindu Philosophy, pp. 192 ff.; the same author's translation of the commencement of the Mahābhāshya, p. 10; and Müller's article on the last-named work in the journal of the German Or. Soc. vii. 170). Śankara states his conclusion to be that "from the eternal word, in the form of *sphoṭa*, which designates [all things], the object to be designated, viz., the world, under the three characters of *action*, *causer*, and the *results* of action, is produced," and finishes his remarks on this Sūtra (i. 3, 28) by observing: "Consequently there is no contradiction in saying that the individual gods, etc., are derived from eternal words." He then proceeds to Sūtra i. 3, 29 :—"'Hence results the eternity of the Vedas.'" On this he observes, "The eternity of the Veda had been established by the fact that it was remembered by its Self-dependent Maker. But a doubt had been suggested that this eternity is inconsistent with the admission that individual gods, etc., have commenced to

exist. This doubt, however, having been set aside by the preceding aphorism, 'Since they are produced from it,' he now confirms the eternity of the Veda (which had been already proved) by the words of the Sūtra before us, which mean that as a result of this very fact that the world, consisting of gods and other beings belonging to fixed species, was produced from the words of the Vedas, the eternity of these Vedic words themselves also must be believed. Accordingly, the words of the hymn, 'by sacrifice they followed the path of Vāch, and found her entered into the rishis' (R. V. x. 71, 3; see Part Second, p. 220) prove that Vāch already existed when she was discovered. And in the very same way Vedavyāsa records that, 'formerly the great rishis, empowered by Svayambhū, obtained through devotion the Vedas and Itihāsas, which had disappeared at the end of the preceding *yuga*.'"

SECT. VIII.—*Arguments of the followers of the Nyāya and Sānkhya Systems in support of the authority of the Vedas, but against the eternity of sound.*

I.—*The Nyāya.*—The eternity of sound is, as we have already discovered from the allusions of the Mīmānsaka commentator, (above p. 55), denied by the followers of the Nyāya school. The consideration of this subject is begun in the following way in the Nyāya aphorisms of Gotama, as explained by Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭāchārya in the Nyāya-sūtra-vṛitti, ii. 81.

Vedasya prāmāṉyam āpta-prāmāṉyāt siddham | na cha idaṁ yujyate vedasya nityatvād ity āśaṇkāyāṁ varṉānām anityatvāt kathaṁ tatsamudāya-rūpasya vedasya nityatvam ity āśayena śabdānityatva-prakaraṇam ārabhate | tatra siddhānta-sūtram | 'Ādimattvād aindriyakatvāt kṛitakatvād upachārāchcha' | 81 | śabdo 'nitya ityādiḥ | ādimattvāt sakāraṇakatvāt | nanu na sakāraṇakatvaṁ kaṇṭha-tālvādy-abhighātāder vyañjakatvenāpy upapatter ata āha aindriyakatvād iti sāmānyavattve sati vahir-indriya-janya-laukika-pratyaxa-vishayatvād ity arthaḥ | . . . . .

Aprayojakatvam āśaṇkya āha kṛitaketi | kṛitake ghaṭādau yathā upachāro jñānaṁ tathaiva kāryyatva-prakāraka-pratyaxa-vishayatvād ityarthaḥ | tathā cha kāryatvena anāhāryya-sārvalaukika-pratyaxa-balād anityatvam eva siddhati. "It has been proved (in the 68th Sūtra, see below) that 'the authority of the Veda follows from the authority of the wise person who made it.' But it may be objected that this is not a proper ground on which to base the authority of the Veda, since it is eternal. With the view of proving, in opposition to this, that since letters are not eternal, the Veda, which is a collection of letters, cannot be so either, the author of the Sūtras commences the section on the non-eternity of sound. The Sūtra laying down the established doctrine is as follows:—'Sound cannot be eternal, as (1) it had an origin, as (2) it is cognizable by sense, and (3) it is spoken of as factitious.' Sound is non-eternal, etc., because (1) it had a beginning, *i.e.*, because it had a cause. But it may be said that it had no *cause*, as, agreeably to the doctrine of the Mīmānsakas (see above, p. 56), the action of the throat and palate in pronunciation may merely occasion a *manifestation* of sound without *creating* it. In reply to this, it is said (2) that sound is cognizable by sense, *i.e.*, that though it belongs to a genus, it is an object of ordinary perception through an external sense." [A different explanation given by other interpreters is next quoted, which I omit.] "Then surmising that the preceding definition may be regarded as not to the point, the author adds the words 'as it is spoken of as factitious,' *i.e.*, as jars and other such objects are spoken of as,—are known to be,—products, so, too, sound is distinguishable by sense as being in the nature of a product. And in consequence of this necessary [or incontrovertible?] and universal perception of its being *produced*, it is proved that it cannot be eternal." [Two other explanations of this last clause of the Sūtra are then added.]

Leaving the reader to study the details of the discussion in Dr. Ballantyne's aphorisms of the Nyāya (Part Second, pp.

77 ff.), I will pass over most of the Sūtras, and merely quote the principal conclusions of the Nyāya aphorist. In Sūtra 86 he says, in opposition to the 13th Sūtra of the Mīmānsa (above, p. 56);

86.—'*Prāg uchchāraṇād anupalambhād āvaraṇādy-anupalabdheḥ*' | *Śabdo yadi nityaḥ syād uchchāraṇāt prāg apy upalabhyeta śrotra-sannikarsha-sattvāt* | *na cha atra pratibandhakam asti ityāha āvaraṇeti āvaraṇādeḥ pratibandhakasya anupalabdhyā abhāva-nirṇayāt* | *deśāntara-gamanantu śabdasya amūrttatvād na sambhāvyate* | *atīndriyānanta-pratibandhakatva-kalpanām apexya śabdānityatva-kalpanā eva laghīyasī iti bhāvaḥ.* "'Sound is not eternal, because it is not perceived before it is uttered, and because we do not perceive anything which should intercept it.' If sound were eternal, it would be perceived even before it was uttered, from its being in contact with the ear. [Sound, as Dr. Ballantyne explains, is admitted to be a quality of the all-pervading ether.] And in the next words the aphorist says that there is no obstacle to its being so heard, since the non-existence of any hindrance, such as an intercepting medium, is ascertained by our not perceiving anything of that sort. And it is not conceivable that sound should have gone to another place [and for that reason be inaudible], since it has no defined form. The supposition that sound is non-eternal, is simpler than the supposition that there are an infinity of imperceptible obstacles to its perception."

The 89th and 90th Sūtras, with part of the comments on them, are as follows:—89. '*Asparśatvāt*' | *śabdo nityaḥ* | *asparśatvād gagana-vad iti bhāvaḥ* | 90. '*Na karmānityatvāt*' | *asparśvatvañ na śabda-nityatva-sādhakañ karmaṇi vyabhichārāt.* 89. "It may be said that sound is eternal, from its being, like the sky, intangible. 90. But this is no proof, for the intangibility of sound does not establish its eternity, since these two qualities do not always go together; for intangibility, though predicable, *e.g.*, of action, fails to prove its eternity."

The 100th and following Sūtras are as follows:—100. '*Vinā-*

śa-kāraṇānupalabdheḥ' | 101. *'Aśravaṇa-kāraṇānupalabdheḥ satata-śravaṇa-prasaṇgaḥ'* | *Yady apratyaxād abhāva-siddhis tadā 'śravaṇa-kāraṇasya apratyaxatvād aśravaṇaṁ na syād iti satata-śravaṇa-prasaṇga iti bhāvaḥ* || 102. *' Upalabhyamāne cha anupalabdher asattvād anapadeśaḥ'* || *Anumānādinā upalabhyamāne vināśa-kāraṇe anupalabdher abhāvāt tvadīyo hetur anapadeśaḥ asādhakaḥ asiddhatvāt* | *janyabhāvatvena vināśakalpanam iti bhāvaḥ.* "It is said (100) that 'sound must be eternal, because we perceive no cause why it should cease.' The answer is (101), first, 'that if the *non-existence* of any such cause of cessation were established by the mere fact of its not being perceived, such non-perception would occasion our hearing continually, which is an absurdity.' And (102), secondly, 'since such non-perception is not a fact, inasmuch as [a cause of the cessation of sound] *is* perceived, this argument falls to the ground.' Since a cause for the cessation of sound is discovered by inference, etc., and thus the non-perception of any cause is seen to be untrue, this argument of yours proves nothing, because its correctness is not established. The purport is that we suppose, from sound being produced, that it must also be liable to perish."

Sūtras 106—122 are occupied with a consideration of the question (above treated, pp. 56, 57, in Sūtras 10 and 16 of the Mīmānsa) whether letters can change or not. The conclusion at which Gotama arrives is, that the substance of letters cannot undergo any alteration, though they may be said to change when they are modified in quality by being lengthened, shortened, etc.

In a preceding part of the Second Book (Sūtras 57—68) Gotama treats of the Veda, and repels certain charges which are alleged against its authority. I shall quote most of these aphorisms, and cite the commentary more fully than Dr. Ballantyne has done. (See Ballantyne's Nyāya Aphorisms, Part ii. pp. 56 ff.)

Śabdasya dṛishṭādṛishṭārthakatvena dvaividhyam uktaṁ tatra

cha adṛishṭārthaka-śabdasya vedasya prāmāṉyam parīxitum pūrva-paxayati ‖ 57. *'Tad-aprāmāṉyam anṛita-vyāghāta-punarukta-doshebhyaḥ'* ‖ *Tasya dṛishṭārthaka-vyatirikta-śabdasya vedasya aprāmāṉyam* | *kutaḥ* | *anṛitatvādi-doshāt* | *tatra cha putreshṭi-kāryādau kvachit phalānutpatti-darśanād anṛitatvam* | *vyāghātaḥ pūrvāpara-virodhaḥ* | *yathā 'udite juhoti anudite juhoti samayādhyushite juhoti* | *śyāvo 'sya āhutim abhyavaharati ya udite juhoti śavalo 'sya āhutim abhyavaharati yo 'nudite juhoti śyāva-śavalāv asya āhutim abhyavaharato yaḥ samayādhyushite juhoti' atra cha uditādi-vākyāṉāṁ nindānumitānishṭa-sādhanatā-bodhaka-vākya-virodhaḥ* | *paunaruktyād aprāmāṉyam* | *Yathā triḥ prathamām anvāha* | *trir uttamām anvāha* | *ity atra uttamatvasya prathamatva-paryavasānāt triḥ kathanena cha paunaruktyam* | *eteshām aprāmāṉye tad-dṛishṭāntena tad-eka-karttṛikatvena tad-eka-jātīyatvena vā sarva-vedāprāmāṉyaṁ sādhanīyam iti bhāvaḥ* | *siddhānta-sūtram* ‖ 58. *'Na karma-karttṛi-sādhana-vaiguṉyāt'* ‖ *Na vedāprāmāṉyaṁ karma-karttṛi-sādhana-vaiguṉyāt phalābhāvopapatteḥ* | *karmaṉaḥ kriyāyā vaiguṉyam ayathāvidhitvādi* | *karttur vaiguṉyam avidvattvādi* | *sādhanasya havir-āder vaiguṉyam āproxitatvādi* | *Yathokta-karmaṉaḥ phalābhave hy anṛitatvam* | *na cha evam asti iti bhāvaḥ* | *vyāghātam pariharati* ‖ 59. *'Abhyupetya kāla-bhede dosha-vachanāt'* ‖ *na vyāghāta iti śeshaḥ* | *Agnyādhāna-kāle udita-homādikam abhyupetya svīkṛitya anudita-homādi-karaṉe pūrvokta-doshakathanād na vyāghāta ity arthaḥ* | *paunaruktyam pariharati* ‖ 60. *Anuvādopapattesścha* ‖ *chaḥ punar-arthe* | *anuvādopapatteḥ punar na paunaruktyam* | *nishprayojanatve hi paunaruktyaṁ doshaḥ* | *ukta-sthale tv anuvādasya upapatteḥ prayojanasya sambhavāt* | *ekādaśa-sāmidhenīnām prathamottamayos trir abhidhāne hi pañchadaśatvaṁ sambhavati* | *tathācha pañchadaśatvaṁ śrūyate* | *'Imam aham bhrātṛivyam pañchadaśāvareṇa vāg-vajreṇa cha bādhe yo 'smān dveshṭi yañcha vayaṁ dvishma' iti* | *Anuvādasya sārthakatvaṁ loka-prasiddham ity āha* ‖ 61. *Vākya-vibhāgasya cha artha-grahaṉāt* ‖ *Vākya-vibhāgasya* | *anuvādatvena vibhakta-vākyasya artha-grahaṉāt prayojana-svīkārāt* |

śishṭair iti śeshaḥ | śishṭā hi vidhāyakānuvādakādi-bhedena vākyāṁ vibhajya anuvādakasyāpi saprayojanatvam manyante | Vede 'py evam iti bhāvaḥ | . . . Evam aprāmāṇya-sādhakaṁ nirasya prāmāṇyaṁ sādhayati || 68. *Mantrāyurveda-vachcha tat-prāmāṇyam āpta-prāmāṇyāt* || *Āptasya veda-karttuḥ prāmāṇyāt yathārthopadeśakatvād vedasya taduktatvam arthāl labdham | tena hetunā vedasya prāmāṇyam anumeyam | tatra dṛishṭāntam āha mantrāyurveda-vad iti | mantro vishādi-nāśakaḥ | āyurveda-bhāgaścha veda-stha eva | tatra śaṁvādena prāmāṇya-grahāt tad-dṛishṭāntena vedatvāvachhedena prāmāṇyam anumeyam | āptaṁ gṛihītam prāmāṇyaṁ yatra sa vedas tādriśenā vedatvena prāmāṇyam anumeyam iti kechit.* "It had been declared (Nyāya Sūtras i. 8) that verbal evidence is of two kinds, (1) that of which the subject-matter is seen, and (2) that of which the subject-matter is unseen. With the view, now, of testing the authority of that verbal evidence which refers to unseen things, viz., the Veda, Gotama states the first side of the question. Sūtra 57. 'The Veda has no authority, since it has the defects of falsehood, self-contradiction, and tautology.' That verbal evidence which is distinct from such as relates to visible objects, *i.e.*, the Veda, has no authority. Why? Because it has the defects of falsehood, etc. Of these defects, that of 'falsehood' is exemplified in the fact that we sometimes observe that no fruit results from performing the sacrifice for a son, or the like. 'Self-contradiction' is a discrepancy between a former and a later declaration. Thus the Veda says, 'he sacrifices when the sun is risen; he sacrifices when the sun is not yet risen; he sacrifices in the morning twilight. A tawny [demon?] carries away the oblation of him who sacrifices after the sun has risen; a brindled [demon?] carries off the oblation of him who sacrifices before the sun has risen; and both of these two carry off the oblation of him who sacrifices in the morning twilight.' Now here there is a contradiction between the words which enjoin sacrifices and the words which intimate by censure that those sacrifices will occasion disastrous results. Again, the Veda has no authority,

owing to its 'tautology,' as where it is said, 'he repeats the first thrice, he repeats the last thrice.' For as the *lastness* ultimately coincides with [?] the *firstness*, and as there is a triple repetition of the words, this sentence is tautological. Now since these particular sentences have no authority, the entire Veda will be proved by these specimens to stand in the same predicament, since all its other parts have the same author, or are of the same character, as these portions."

Here follows the Sūtra which conveys the established doctrine. "58. 'The Veda is not false; it is owing to some fault in the ceremonial, or the performer, or the instrument he employs, that any sacrifice is ineffectual.' Faults in the ceremonial are such as its not being according to rule. Faults in the performer are such as ignorance. Faults in the instrument, *i.e.*, in the clarified butter, etc., are such as its not being duly sprinkled, etc. For falsehood might be charged on the Veda, if no fruit resulted from a sacrifice when duly performed; but such is not the case."

Gotama next repels the charge of self-contradiction in the Vedas. "59. 'There is no self-contradiction, for the fault is only imputed in case the sacrifice should be performed at a different time from that at first intended.' The fault imputed to these sacrifices in the text in question would [only] be imputed if, after agreeing, at the time of placing the sacrificial fire, to perform the sacrifice after sunrise, one were to change it to a sacrifice before sunrise; there is, therefore, no self-contradiction in the passage referred to."

He next rebuts the charge of tautology. "60. 'The Veda is not tautological, because repetition may be proper.' The particle '*cha*' means again. 'Again, since repetition may be proper, there is no tautology.' For repetition is only a fault when it is useless. But in the passage referred to, since repetition is proper, its utility is apparent. For when the first and the last of the *eleven sāmidhenīs* (forms of prayer used on throwing fuel into the fire) are each repeated thrice, the whole number

of verses will be made up to *fifteen*.[42] Accordingly, this number of fifteen is mentioned in these words of the Veda, 'I smite this enemy who hates us, and whom we hate, with the last of the fifteen verses, and with the thunderbolt of my words.'"

He next observes that the advantage of repetition is commonly recognised. "61. 'And the Veda is not tautological, because the utility of this division of discourse is admitted, *i.e.*, because the necessity for a division of language, that is, of a description of language characterized as reiterative, is acknowledged by the learned. For by dividing language into the different classes of *injunctive, reiterative*, etc., learned men recognise the uses of the reiterative also. And this applies to the Veda."

The author of the aphorisms then proceeds to state and to define (in Sūtras 62—67) the different sorts of discourse employed in the Veda, and to defend the propriety of reiteration. "Having thus refuted the arguments which aim at showing that the Veda is of no authority, he goes on to prove its authority. 68. 'The authority of the Veda, like that of the spells and the medical treatise, follows from the authority of the wise [person who made it].' Since a wise [person], the maker of a Veda, possesses authority, *i.e.*, is one who inculcates truth, it results from the force of the terms that the Veda was uttered by a person of this character; and by this reasoning the authority of the Veda is to be inferred. He illustrates this by the case of the spells and medical treatise. By spells (*mantra*) are meant the formulæ which neutralize poison, etc., and the section of the medical treatise (*āyurveda*) forms part of the Veda. Now as the authority of these two writings is admitted by general consent, the authority of everything which possesses the characteristics of the Veda must be inferred from this example. Some, however, explain the aphorism thus: a Veda is that in which authority is found or recognized. From such *vedicity* (or pos-

[42] If there are in all *eleven* formulæ, and *two* of these are *each* repeated *thrice*, we have ($2 \times 3 =$) *six* to add to the *nine* (which remain of the original *eleven*), making ($6 + 9 =$) *fifteen*. See Müller's Anc. Sans. Lit. pp. 89 and 393.

session of the character of a *Veda*), the authority of any work is to be inferred."

It is not necessary to regard this 68th Sūtra as expressing the ultimate grounds on which Gotama would have vindicated the authority of the Vedas against its gainsayers. It is sufficient to consider the aphorism as merely indicating the proper basis on which the great logician thought that the infallibility of the Vedas should be defended, in opposition to those who maintained that their authority was derived from their eternity. Gotama denied this eternity, and deduced the infallibility of the Vedas from the infallibility of their author. In arguing with a disbeliever in the Vedas, he would have had to prove that they had really proceeded from an infallible author.

II. *The Sānkhya.*—The opinions of the author of the Sānkhya aphorisms in regard to the authority of the Veda and the principles on which that authority depends, are contained in the 45th to the 51st aphorisms of the Fifth Book, which I extract with the comments of Vijnāna Bhikshu.[43] 45. *'Na nityatvaṁ Vedānāṁ kāryatva-śruteḥ' || 'Sa tapo 'tapyata tasmāt tapas tepānāt trayo vedā ajāyanta' ity ādi-śruter vedānāṁ na nityatvam ity arthaḥ | veda-nityatā-vākyāni cha sajātīyānupūrvī-pravāhānuchchheda-parāṇi | Tarhi kim paurusheyā vedāḥ | na ityāha || 46. 'Na paurusheyatvaṁ tatkartuḥ purushasya abhāvāt' || īśvara-pratishedād iti śeshaḥ | sugamam | aparaḥ karttā bhavatv ity ākāṇxāyām āha || 47. 'Muktāmuktayor ayogyatvāt' || Jīvan-mukta-dhurīṇo Vishṇur viśuddha-sattvatayā niratiśaya-sarvajño 'pi vītarāgatvāt sahasra-śākha-veda-nirmāṇāyogyaḥ | amuktas tv asarvajñatvād eva ayogya ity arthaḥ | nanv evam apaurusheyatvād nityatvam eva āgatam | tatrāha || 48. 'Na apaurusheyatvād nityatvam aṇkurādi-vat' || Spashṭam | nanv aṇkurādishv api kāryatvena ghaṭādi-vat paurusheyatvam anumeyam | tatrāha || 49. 'Teshām api tadyoge dṛishṭa-bādhādi-prasaktiḥ' || Yat paurusheyaṁ tach chharīra-janyam iti vyāptir loke dṛishṭā tasyā*

[43] Dr. Ballantyne's edition of the Sānkhya Sūtras does not, I believe, as yet extend beyond the fourth book.

bādhādir evam sati syād iti arthaḥ | nanv Ādi-purushochcharitatvād Vedā api paurusheyā eva ity āha || 50. 'Yasmin adṛishṭe 'pi kṛita-buddhir upajāyate tat paurusheyam' || Dṛishṭe iva adrishṭe 'pi yasmin vastuni kṛita-buddhir buddhi-pūrvakatva-buddhir jāyate tad eva paurusheyam iti vyavahriyate ity arthaḥ | etad uktam bhavati | na purushochcharitatā-mātreṇa paurusheyatvaṁ śvāsa-praśvāsayoḥ sushupti-kālīnayoḥ paurusheyatva-vyavahārābhāvāt kintu buddhi-pūrvakatvena | Vedāstu niḥśvāsavad eva adṛishṭa-vaśād abuddhi-pūrvakā eva Svayambhuvo sakāśāt svayam bhavanti | ato na te paurusheyāḥ | tathā cha śrutiḥ 'tasyaitasya mahato bhūtasya niśvasitam etad yad ṛigvedo ity ādir' iti | nanv evam yarthārtha-vākyārtha-jñānāpūrvakatvāt śuka-vākyasyeva vedānām api prāmāṇyaṁ na syāt tatrāha || 51. 'Nija-śakty-abhvyakteḥ svataḥ prāmāṇyam' || Vedānāṁ nijā svābhāvikī yā yathārtha-jñāna-janana-śaktis tasyā mantrāyurvedādāv abhivyakter upalambhād akhila-vedānām eva svata eva prāmāṇyaṁ siddhyati na vaktṛi-yathārtha-jñāna-mūlakatvādinā ity arthaḥ | tathā cha Nyāya-sūtram | 'mantrāyurveda-prāmāṇya-vachcha tat-prāmāṇyam' iti.

"Sūtra 45. 'Eternity cannot be predicated of the Vedas, since various texts in these books themselves declare them to have been produced.' The sense is this, that the Vedas are proved not to be eternal by such texts as the following: 'He performed austerity; from him, when he had thus performed austerity, the three Vedas were produced.' [See above, p. 3.] Those other texts which assert the eternity [or perpetuity] of the Vedas refer merely to the unbroken continuity of the stream of homogeneous succession [or tradition]. Are the Vedas, then, derived from any personal author? 'No,' he replies in Sūtra 46. 'The Vedas are not derived from any personal author (*paurusheya*), since there is no person (*purusha*) to make them.' We must supply the words, 'since an *Īśvara* (God) is denied.' The sense is easy. In answer to the supposition that there may be some other maker, he remarks, Sūtra 47, 'No; for there could be no fit maker, either liberated or unliberated.' Vishnu, the chief of

all those beings who are liberated even while they live,[44] though, from the pure goodness of his nature, he is possessed of perfect omniscience, would, owing to his impassiveness, be unfit to compose the Veda consisting of a thousand śākhās (branches), while any unliberated person would be unfit for the task from want of omniscience. (See Śankara's comment on Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 3; above, p. 52, note.) But does not, then, the eternity of the Vedas follow from their having no personal author? He replies (48), 'Their eternity does not result from their having no personal author, since they resemble a bud, which sprouts from some root.' This is clear. But is it not to be inferred that buds, etc., since they are products, have, like jars, etc., some personal maker? He replies (49), 'If such a supposition were applied to the Vedas, it would there also be exposed to the objection that it is contrary to what we see, etc.' Whatever is derived from a personal author is produced from a body; this is a rule which is seen to hold invariably. But if we assert that the Vedas are derived from a personal author, we contradict the rule in question, [since the Vedas evidently did not spring from any one's body].' But are not the Vedas, too, derived from a person, seeing that they were uttered by the primeval Purusha? He answers (50), 'That object only (even though it be an invisible one), which its maker is conscious of having made, can be said to be derived from [or made by] a person.' It is only those objects, be they seen or unseen, in regard to which a consciousness of design arises, that are ordinarily spoken of as made by a person. The sense is, that it is not mere utterance by a person which constitutes formation by that person (since we do not ordinarily speak of the inspirations and expirations of any person during the time of sleep, as being *formed* by that person), but only utterance with conscious design. But the Vedas proceed of their own accord from Svayambhū (the self-existent), like an expiration, by the force of *adṛishṭa* (destiny), without any consciousness on his part. Hence they are not

[44] See Colebrooke's Essays, i. 369, or p. 241 of Williams and Norgate's ed.

formed by any person. Thus the Veda says, 'This Rig-veda, etc., is the breath of this great Being, etc.' [See above, p. 7.] But will not the Vedas, also, be in this way destitute of authority, like the chatter of a parrot, since they did not result from any knowledge of the correct meaning of the words of which they are made up? In reference to this, he says (51), 'The Vedas have a self-proving authority, since their inherent power is manifested.' The self-evidencing authority of the *entire* Vedas is established by the manifestation, or perception, in certain portions of them, viz., the 'spells' and the 'medical treatise,' etc., of that inherent power which they (the Vedas) possess of generating correct knowledge, and does not depend on its being shown that they (the Vedas) are founded on correct knowledge in their utterer, or on any other ground of that sort. And to this effect is the Nyāya Sūtra, that 'its authority is like the authority of the spells and the medical treatise.'" (See above, p. 80.)

In the 57th and following Sūtras of the same book, Kapila denies that sound has the character of *sphoṭa*, or that it is eternal. 57. '*Pratītyapratītibhyāṁ na sphoṭātmakaḥ śabdaḥ*' ‖ *Pratyeka-varṇebhyo 'tiriktaṁ kalaśa ityādi-rūpam akhaṇḍam eka-padam sphoṭa iti yogair abhyupagamyate | kambu-grīvādy-avayavebhyo 'tirikto ghaṭādy-avayavīva | sa cha śabda-viśesho padākhyo 'rtha-sphuṭīkaraṇāt sphoṭa ity uchyate | sa śabdo 'prāmāṇikaḥ | kutaḥ | pratītyapratītibhyām | sa śabdaḥ kim pratīyate na vā | ādye yena varṇa-samudāyena ānupurvī-viśesha-visishṭena so 'bhivyajyate tasya eva artha-pratyāyakatvam astu | kim antargaḍunā tena | antye tv ajñāta-sphoṭasga nāsty artha-pratyāyana-śaktir iti vyarthā sphoṭa-kalpanā ity arthaḥ | Pūrvaṁ vedānāṁ nityatvam pratishiddham | idanīṁ varṇa-nityatvam api pratishedati* ‖ 58. '*Na śabda-nityatvaṁ kāryatā-pratīteḥ*' ‖ *Sa eva ayaṁ ga-kāra ityādi-pratyabhijñā-balād varṇa-nityatvaṁ na yuktam | utpanno ga-kāra ityādi-pratyayena anityatva-siddher ity arthaḥ | pratyabhijñā tajjātīyatā-vishayiṇī | anyathā ghaṭāder api pratyabhijñayā nityatāpatter iti | śaṇkate* ‖

59. *'Pūrva-siddha-sattvasya abhivyaktir dīpeneva ghaṭasya' || Nanu pūrva-siddha-sattākasyaiva śabdasya dhvanyādibhir yā 'bhivyaktis tanmātram utpattiḥ pratīter vishayaḥ | abhivyaktau dṛishṭānto dīpeneva ghaṭasya iti | Pariharati || 60. 'Satkāryya-siddhāntaś chet siddha-sādhanam' || Abhivyaktir yady anāgatā-vasthā-tyāgena varttamānāvasthā-lābha ity uchyate tadā sat-kāryya-siddhāntaḥ | tādṛiśa-nityatvañcha sarva-kāryāṇām eva iti siddha-sādhanam ity arthaḥ | yadi cha varttamānatayā sata eva jñāna-mātra-rūpiṇy abhivyaktir uchyate tadā ghaṭadīnām api nityatvāpattir ityādi.* "'Sound has not the character of *sphoṭa*, from the dilemma that it must be either apparent or not apparent.' A modification of sound called *sphoṭa*, single, indivisible, distinct from individual letters, existing in the form of words like *kalaśa* (jar), distinguished also from *parts* of words like *kambu-grīva* (striped-neck), and forming a whole like the word *ghaṭa* (jar), is assumed by the Yogas. And this species of sound called a word (*pada*) is designated *sphoṭa* from its manifesting a meaning. But the existence of this form of sound is destitute of proof. Why? 'From the dilemma that it must be either apparent or not apparent.' Does this form of sound appear or not? If it appears, then let the power of disclosing a meaning [which is ascribed by our opponents to *sphoṭa*] be regarded as belonging to that collection of letters, arranged in a particular order, by which the supposed *sphoṭa* is manifested. What necessity is there for that superfluous *sphoṭa?* If, on the contrary, it does *not* appear, then that *unknown sphoṭa* can have no power of disclosing a meaning, and consequently it is useless to suppose that any such thing as *sphoṭa* exists.

"The eternity of the Vedas had been already denied. He now denies the eternity of letters also. 58. 'Sound is not eternal, since it is clear that it is a production.' The meaning is, that it is not reasonable to infer on the strength of the recognition of the letter G as the same that we knew before (see Mīmānsā Aphorisms i. 13; above, p. 56), that letters are eternal; since it is clear that G and other letters are *produced*,

and therefore cannot be eternal. The recognition of these letters has reference to their being of the *same kind* as we have perceived before; since otherwise we are landed in the absurdity that, because we recognize a jar or any other such object to be the same, it must therefore be eternal.

"He expresses a doubt: 59. 'What we hear may be merely the *manifestation* of a previously existing thing, as a jar is *manifested* (not created) by the light of a lamp.' (See Mīmānsā Aphorisms, i. 12, 13; above, p. 56.) Is it not the fact that it is merely the *manifestation* of language by sounds, etc., which begins to exist as an object of perception? An illustration of such *manifestation* is that of a jar by means of a lamp.

"He repels this doubt: 60. 'If the axiom that an effect exists in its cause be here intended, this is merely proving what is already admitted.' If by *manifestation* is meant the relinquishment by any substance of its previous undeveloped state,[45] and the attainment of its present developed state, then we have merely the recognized principle of an effect virtually existing in its cause (see Sānkhya Kārika Aph. ix.); and as such eternity is truly predicable of all effects whatever, it is *proving a thing already proved* to assert it here. If, on the other hand, by manifestation be merely meant the perception of a thing actually existing, then we shall be involved in the absurdity of admitting that jars, etc., also are eternal, etc."

SECT. IX.—*Some further reasonings in support of the supernatural origin of the Veda, and distinction in point of authority between it and the Smṛitis or non-Vedic Śāstras as stated by the Commentators on the Taittirīya Yajur-veda, the Pūrva Mīmānsā, Manu, and the Vedanta, etc.; difference of opinion between Śankara and Madhusūdana regarding the orthodoxy of Kapila and Kaṇāda.*

I.—*The Nyāya-mālā-vistara.*—I shall begin this section with an extract on the supernatural origin of the Veda from the *Nyāya-mālā-vistara*, a summary of the doctrines of the Pūrva Mīmānsā of

[45] *Literally*, "the state of being not yet arrived at something" [?]

Jaimini, by Mādhava Āchāryya, the brother of Sāyaṇa Āchāryya (see above, p. 40). Nyāya-mālā-vistara i. 1, 25, 26 : *Paurusheyaṁ na vā veda-vākyaṁ syāt paurusheyatā | Kāṭhakādi-samākhyānād vākyatvāchchānya-vākya-vat | Samākhyā 'dhyāpakatvena vākyatvantu parāhatam | Tatkartranupalambhena syāt tato 'paurusheyatā || Kāṭhakaṁ Kauthumaṁ Taittirīyakam ityādi samākhyā tattad-veda-vishayā loke dṛishṭā | taddhita-pratyayaśscha tena proktam ity asminn arthe varttate | tathā sati Vyāsena proktaṁ Vaiyāsikam Bhāratam ity ādāv iva paurusheyatvam pratīyate | kiñcha | vimataṁ veda-vākyam paurusheyam | vākyatvāt | Kālidāsādi-vākya-vad iti prāpte brūmaḥ | adhyayana-sampradāya-pravarttakatvena samākhyā upapadyate | Kālidāsādi-grantheshu tat-sargāvasāne karttāra upalabhyante | tathā vedasyāpi paurusheyatve tat-karttā upalabhyeta na cha upalabhyate | ato vākyatva-hetuḥ pratikūla-tarka-parāhataḥ | tasmād apaurusheyo vedaḥ | tathā sati purusha-buddhi-kṛitasya aprāmāṇyasya anāśaṇkanīyatvād vidhivākyasya dharme prāmāṇyaṁ susthitam.*[46] "[Verses] 'Is the word of the Veda of human origin or not? It must be human, since (1) it bears the names of Kāthaka, etc., and (2) has the characters of a sentence, like other sentences. No; for (1) the names arose from particular persons being *teachers* of the Vedas, and (2) the objection that the Vedic precepts have the characters of common sentences is refuted by other considerations. For the Veda must be supernatural, since it has never been known to have had a maker.' [Comment] It is objected (1) that the names Kāthaka, Kauthuma, Taittirīyaka, etc., are applied in common usage to the different Vedas; and the *taddhita* affix by which these appellations are formed, denotes 'uttered by' [Kaṭha, Kuthumi, and Tittiri] (comp. Pānini iv. 3, 101). Such being the case, it is clear that these parts of the Vedas are of human origin [or derived from a person, *purusha*], like the

[46] I have extracted this passage from Prof. Goldstücker's unpublished text of the Nyāya-mālā-vistara; and I am indebted to the same profound scholar for some assistance in my translation of it.

Mahābhārata, which is styled *Vaiyāsika*, because it was uttered by Vyāsa, etc. And further (2), the sentences of the Veda, being subject to different interpretations, are of human origin, because they have the properties of a sentence, like the sentences of Kālidāsa, etc. To this we reply (1), the name applied to any Veda originates in the fact that the sage whose name it bears, was an agent in transmitting the study of that Veda. But (2) in the books of Kālidāsa and others, the authors are discoverable [from the notices] at the end of each section. Now if the Veda also were of human composition, the author of it would, in like manner, be discoverable; but such is not the case. Hence, the objection that the Veda partakes of the nature of common sentences is refuted by opposing considerations. Consequently the Veda is superhuman. And such being the case, as we cannot suspect in it any fallibility occasioned by the defects of human reason, the preceptive texts of the Veda are demonstrated to be authoritative in questions of duty."

II.— *Vedārtha-prakāśa*.—The verses just quoted are repeated in the Vedārtha-prakāśa of Mādhava on the Taittirīya Sanhitā (p. 26), with a various reading at the beginning of the third line, viz., '*samākhyānam pravachanāt*' instead of '*samākhyā 'dhyāpakatvena*.' The comment by which the verses are explained in the same work, is as follows:— *Vālmīkīyaṁ Vaiyāsikīyam ityādi-samākhyānād Rāmāyaṇa-Bhāratādikaṁ yathā paurusheyaṁ tathā Kāṭhakaṁ Kauthumaṁ Taittirīyam ityādi-samākhyānād vedaḥ paurusheyaḥ | kiñcha veda-vākyam paurusheyaṁ vākyatvāt Kālidāsādi-vākya-vad iti chet | maivam | sampradāya-pravṛittyā samākhyopapatteḥ | Vākyatva-hetus tv anupalabdhi-viruddha-kālātyayāpadishṭaḥ | Yathā Vyāsa-Vālmīki-prabhṛitayas tad-grantha-nirmāṇāvasare kaiśchid upalabdhāḥ | anyair apy avichhinna-sampradāyena upalabhyante | na tathā veda-karttā purushaḥ kaśchid upalabdhaḥ | pratyuta veda-asya nityatvaṁ śruti-smṛitibhyām pūrvam udāhṛitam | Paramātmā tu veda-karttā 'pi na laukika-purushaḥ | tasmāt karttṛi-doshābhāvād nāsty aprāmāṇya-śaṇkā.* "It may be said (1) that

as the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, and other such books, are regarded as the works of men from the epithets *Vālmīkiya* (composed by Vālmīki), *Vaiyāsikīya* (composed by Vyāsa), etc., which they bear, so too the Veda must be of human origin, since it is called by the appellations of *Kāṭhaka*, *Kauthuma*, and *Taittirīya*, etc.; and further (2), that the word of the Veda must be human, because it possesses the properties of a common sentence. But these objections are unfounded, for (1) the appellation of any part of the Veda is derived from some sage who was an agent in transmitting the study of it; and (2) the objection about the Veda having the properties of a common sentence is opposed to the fact that no author was ever perceived, and is refuted by the length of time [during which the Veda has been received as superhuman]. For though Vyāsa and Vālmīki, etc., when employed in the composition of their respective works, were perceived by some persons to be so engaged, and are known by others also [in after ages] to be the authors, from the existence of an unbroken tradition to that effect;—no human author of the Veda has ever been perceived. On the contrary, we have formerly shown that the eternity of the Veda is declared both by itself and by the Smṛiti. And even if the supreme Spirit be the maker of it; still he is not a mundane person, and consequently, as no defect exists in the maker, there is no reason to suspect fallibility in his work."

I do not know how it has happened that these commentators have taken no notice of an obvious objection which may be raised to the validity of this reasoning, viz., that the hymns of the Rik and other Vedas are all set down in the Anukramaṇīs, or indices to those works, as being uttered by particular rishis; the rishis being, in fact, there defined as those whose words the hymns were—*yasya vākyaṁ sa ṛishiḥ*. (See Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 26, or p. 12 of W. and N.'s ed.) Though, however, this objection has not been noticed in any of the preceding passages, an answer has been provided to it in the well-known assertion of the orthodox Indian writers that the rishis did not

compose, but only *saw* the hymns and other parts of the Vedas, which had in reality pre-existed from eternity.

Thus, in the Vedārtha-prakāsa on the Taittirīya Sanhitā, p. 11, it is said: *Atīndriyārtha-drashṭāra ṛishayaḥ | Teshāṁ veda-drashṭṛitvaṁ smaryate | Yugānte 'ntarhitān*[47] *Vedān setihāsān maharshayaḥ | Lebhire tapasā pūrvam anujñātāḥ svayambhuvā.* (Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva, verse 7,660. See above, p. 73.) "The rishis were *seers* of things beyond the reach of the bodily senses. The fact of their *seeing* the Vedas is recorded in the Smṛiti: 'The great rishis, empowered by Svayambhū, formerly obtained, through devotion, the Vedas and the Itihāsas which had disappeared at the end of the [preceding] Yuga.'"

So, too, Manu (as already quoted, Part First, p. 142) says, *Prajāpatir idaṁ śāstraṁ tapasaivāsṛijat prabhuḥ | Tathaiva vedān ṛishayas tapasā pratipedire.* "Prajāpati created this Śāstra (the Institutes of Manu) by devotion; and by devotion the rishis obtained the Vedas."

See also the passages from the Nirukta in pp. 174 ff. and 205 of the Second Part of this work.

A distinct line of demarcation is generally drawn by the more critical Indian writers between the Vedas and all other classes of Indian Śāstras, however designated. The former are considered to be infallible, and to possess an independent authority; while the latter derive their authority from the Veda alone, and (in theory) are infallible guides only in so far as they coincide with the Veda. This will be clear from the following passages.

I.—*Nyāya-mālā-vistara.*—The first text which I will adduce has been already quoted in the Second Part of this work, but I shall repeat it here for facility of reference. It is from the Nyāya-mālā-vistara i. 3, 24. *Baudhāyanāpastambāśvalāyana-kātyāyanādi-nāmāṅkitāḥ kalpasūtrādi-granthā nigama-nirukta-shaḍaṅga-granthā Manv-ādi-smṛitayaś cha apaurusheyāḥ | dharma-buddhi-janakatvāt | veda-vat | na cha mūla-pramāṇa-sāpex-*

[47] The text of the Biblioth. Ind. reads *tarhi tān*. I have followed the M. Bh., which evidently gives the true reading.

atvena veda-vaishamyam iti śaṇkanīyam | utpannāyā buddheḥ svataḥ-prāmānyāṇgīkāreṇa nirapexatvāt || Maivam | uktānumānasya kālātyayāpadishṭatvāt | Baudhāyana-sūtram Āpastamba-sūtram ity evam purusha-namnā te granthā uchyante | na cha Kāṭhakādi-samākhyā-vat pravachana-nimittatvaṁ yuktam | tad-grantha-nirmāṇa-kāle tadānīntanaiḥ kaiśchid upalabdhatvāt | tachcha avichhinna-pāramparyeṇa anuvarttate | tataḥ Kālidāsādi-grantha-vat paurusheyāḥ | tathāpi veda-mūlatvāt pramāṇam || . . . kalpasya vedatvaṁ nādyāpi siddham | kintu prayatnena sādhanīyam | na cha tat sādhayituṁ śakyam | paurusheyatvasya samākhyayā tat-karttur upalambhena cha sādhitatvāt.

"It may be said that the Kalpa Sūtras and other works designated by the names of Baudhayana, Āpastamba, Aśvalayana, Kātyāyana, etc., and the Nigama, Nirukta, and six Vedāngas, together with the Smṛitis of Manu and others, are superhuman, because they impart a knowledge of duty, as the Vedas do; and that they should not be suspected of inferiority to the Vedas on the ground that they depend upon a primary authority, since the knowledge which they impart is independent, because it is admitted to be self-evidencing. But this view is incorrect, for the inference in question is refuted by the length of time [during which these works have been recognized as human compositions]. The books in question are called by the names of men, as 'the Sūtras of Baudhāyana,' 'the Sūtras of Āpastamba;' and these designations cannot correctly be said to originate in the oral transmission of the works by those teachers whose names they bear (as is really the case in regard to the Kāthaka and other parts of the Veda), for it was known to some of the contemporaries of these men, at the time when they were composing these Sūtras, Smṛitis, etc., that they were so engaged; and this knowledge has descended by unbroken tradition. Hence the books in question are, like the works of Kālidāsa and others, of human origin. Nevertheless, they possess authority, as being founded on the Veda." . . . The following additional remarks represent the opinion of the Guru (Prabhākara) on the same

question: "It is not yet proved that the Kalpa Sūtras possess the character of the Veda; it would require great labour to prove it; and, in fact, it is impossible to prove it. For the human origin of these books is established by the names which they bear, and by their being observed to have had authors."

II.—*Kullūka.*—The same thing is admitted by Kullūka, the commentator on Manu, who (in his remarks on i. 1) thus defines the relation of his author to the Vedas: *Paurusheyatve 'pi Manu-vākyānām avigīta-mahājana-parigrahāt śrutyupagrahāchcha veda-mūlakatayā prāmāṇyam | Tathā cha chhāndogya-brāhmaṇe śrūyate 'Manur vai yat kiñchid avadat tad bheshajam bheshajatāyāḥ' iti | Vṛihaspatir apy āha 'Vedārthopanibandhṛitvāt prādhānyaṁ hi Manoḥ smṛitam | Manvartha-viparītā tu yā smṛitiḥ sā na śasyate | Tāvach chhāstrāṇi śobhante tarka-vyākaraṇāni cha | Dharmārtha-moxopadeshṭā Manur yāvanna dṛiśyate' | Mahābhārate 'py uktam 'Purāṇam Mānavo dharmaḥ sāṅgo vedaś chikitsitam | Ājñā-siddhāni chatvāri na hantavyāni hetubhiḥ' | virodhi Bauddhādi-tarkair na hantavyāni | anukūlastu mīmāṁsādi-tarkaḥ pravarttanīya eva | ata eva vaxyati 'ārshaṁ dharmopadeśañcha veda-śāstrāvirodhinā | yas tarkeṇānusandhatte sa dharmaṁ veda netaraḥ' iti.* "Though the Institutes of Manu had a human author, still, as their reception by illustrious men of unimpeached [orthodoxy], and their conformity to the Veda, prove that they are based upon the latter, they are authoritative. Accordingly it is recorded in the Chhāndogya Brahmana that, 'Whatever Manu said is a medicine of remedial efficacy.' And Vṛihaspati says: 'As Manu expounds the sense of the Veda, he is traditionally celebrated as pre-eminent. But that *smṛiti* which is contrary to the sense of Manu, is not approved. Books [on law?], logic, and grammar are all eclipsed as soon as Manu, our instructor in duty, and in the means of attaining both earthly prosperity, and final liberation, is beheld.' And it is said in the Mahābhārata: 'The Puranas, the institutes of Manu, the Veda with its appendages, and treatises on medicine, these four, which are established by [divine] command,

are not to be assailed by rationalistic arguments;' that is, they are not to be attacked by hostile reasonings, such as those of the Bauddhas. But friendly arguments, such as those of the Mīmānsakas, are to be employed. And accordingly, we shall find below (Manu xii. 106) that he says, 'the man who investigates the injunctions of the rishis, and the rules of duty by reasoning which is agreeable to the Veda, he, and he only, is acquainted with duty.'" (See above, p. 13, note 10.)

III.—*Nyāya-mālā-vistara.*—But the precepts of the smṛiti are not considered useless or superfluous. On the contrary, an authority is attributed to them corresponding to the antiquity, elevated position, and sacred character of their authors. Thus the author of the Nyāya-mālā-vistara says (i. 3, 3): *Vimatā smṛitir veda-mūlā | vaidika-manvādi-praṇīta-smṛititvāt | upanayanādhyayanādi-smṛiti-vat | na cha vaiyarthyaṁ śaṅkanīyam | asmad-ādīnāṁ pratyaxeshu pāroxeshu nānā vedeshu viprakīrṇasya anushṭheyārthasya ekatra saṅxipyamāṇatvāt.* "The variously understood smṛiti is founded on the Veda, because the traditions, such as those regarding investiture, study, etc., have been compiled by Vedic men, such as Manu and others. Nor is it to be surmised that the smṛiti is useless, since it throws together in a condensed form a variety of injunctions regarding matters to be observed, which are scattered through different Vedas, both such as are visible and such as are invisible to us." (This last expression appears to refer to the supposition that some parts of the Veda which Manu and others had before them when compiling their own works, have now been lost. See Müller's Anc. Sans. Lit. pp. 103-107.)

Accordingly the smṛitis have an authority superior to that founded merely on the practice of learned men of modern date derived from their own private study of the Vedas. Thus the Nyāya-mālā-vistara says (i. 3, 19): *Na hi idānīntanāḥ śishṭāḥ Manv-ādi-vad deśa-kāla-viprakṛishtaṁ vedaṁ divya-jñānena sāxātkarttuṁ śaknuvanti yena śishṭāchārō mūla-vedam anumāpayet.* "For learned men of the present day do not possess the power,

which Manu and others had, of placing before their minds, through divine knowledge, the Veda which was far removed from them both in place and time, so as to justify us in regarding the practice of these moderns as a sufficient ground for inferring the existence of a Veda as its foundation."

But as learned men, in any particular country or at any particular time, may be able to consult some smṛiti which authorizes their particular observances, "these observances may serve as ground for inferring the existence of some smṛiti on which they are founded, but not for inferring a Veda: (*tasmāch chhishṭāchāreṇa smṛitir anumātuṁ śakyate na tu śrutiḥ*). But a smṛiti which is thus merely inferred to exist is set aside by any visibly existing smṛiti of contrary import: (*anumitā cha smṛitir viruddhayā pratyaxayā smṛityā bādhyate*)."

IV.—*Śankara.*—The above passages, by assuming that Manu and other eminent sages had the power of consulting Vedic texts now no longer accessible, make them practically almost infallible. The same view is taken by Śankara Āchāryya. (See, however, the passage quoted from him above, in note 31, p. 45.) In answer to the remark of a Mīmānsaka objector stated in the comment on the Brahma Sūtras i. 3, 32, that the Itihāsas and Puranas, being of human origin, have only a derived and secondary authority (*'itihāsa-purāṇam api paurusheyatvāt pramāṇāntara-mūlatām ākāṇxate'*), Śankara argues in his explanation of the following Sūtra (i. 3, 33) that they have an independent foundation: *Itihāsa-purāṇam api vyākhyātena mārgeṇa sambhavad mantrārthavāda-mūlatvāt prabhavati devatāvigrahādi prapañchayitum | pratyaxa-mūlam api sambhavati | bhavati hi asmākam apratyaxam api chirantanānām pratyaxam | tathā cha Vyāsādayo devatābhiḥ pratyaxaṁ vyavaharantīti smaryate | yastu brūyād idānīntanānām iva pūrveshām api nāsti devādibhir vyavaharttuṁ sāmarthyam iti sa jagad-vaichitryam pratishedet | idānīm iva cha na anyadā 'pi sārvabhaumaḥ xatriyo 'stīti brūyāt | tataścha rājasūyādi-chodanā uparundhyāt | idānīm iva cha kālāntare 'py avyavasthita-prāyān varṇāśrama-dhar-*

mān pratijānīta tataścha vyavasthā-vidhāyi śāstram anarthakaṁ kuryāt | Tasmād dharmotkarsha-vaśāt chirantanā devādibhiḥ pratyaxaṁ vyajahrur iti ślishyate | api cha smaranti 'svādhyāyādishṭa-devatā-samprayoga' ityādi | yogo 'py aṇimādy-aiśvarya-prāpti-phalakaḥ smaryamāṇo na śakyate sāhasa-mātreṇa pratyākhyātum | śrutiścha yoga-māhātmyam pratyākhyāpayati | 'pṛithvy-ap-tejo-'nila-khe samutthite pañchātmake yoga-guṇe pravṛitte | na tasyo rogo na jarā na mṛityuḥ prāptasya yogād nimishaṁ śarīram' iti | ṛishīṇām api mantra-brāhmaṇa-darśināṁ sāmarthyaṁ na asmadīyena sāmarthyena upamātuṁ yuktam | tasmāt samūlam itihāsa-purāṇam. "The Itihāsas and Puranas also, having originated in the way which has been explained, have power, as being based on the hymns and arthavādas, to evince the corporeality, etc., of the gods. It is also reasonable to suppose that they are founded upon intuition. For there were things palpable through intuition to the ancients, though they are not thus palpable to us.[48] Accordingly it is recorded in the *smṛiti* that Vyāsa and others associated face to face with the gods.[49] Any man who should maintain that the ancients, like his own contemporaries, were destitute of power thus to associate with superhuman beings like the gods, would be denying all variety in the history of the world. Such a person would in like manner affirm that as now there is no kshattriya possessed of universal sovereignty, so neither was there ever such a prince; and would thus impugn the scriptural injunc-

[48] See Part Second, p. 174; see also Prof. Müller's article on the Vaiśeshika Philosophy in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vol. vii. p. 311, where it is remarked that the Vaiśeshikas, like Kapila, include the intuition of rishis under the category of *pratyaxa* (*ārshaṁ jñānaṁ sūtra-kṛitā pṛithak na laxitam yogi-pratyaxe 'ntarbhāvāt*).

[49] Compare Hesiod, fragment 119: ξυναὶ γὰρ τότε δαῖτες ἔσαν, ξυναὶ δε θόωκοι ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι καταθνήτοις τ'ἀνθρώποις.

"Immortal gods, not unfamiliar, then
Their feasts and converse shared with mortal men."

And Herodotus writes of the Egyptians, ii. 144: Τὸ δὲ πρότερον τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων θεοὺς εἶναι τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἄρχοντας, διαιτεομένους ἅμα τοῖσι ἀνθρώποισι. "And [the Egyptian priests said] that before these men the gods were the rulers in Egypt, dwelling together with men."

tions regarding the *rājasūya* sacrifice [which was only to be performed by a universal monarch]. He would also allege that in former times, as now, the duties of castes and of orders were scarcely at all in force, and would thus render fruitless the scriptures by which the rules relating to them are ordained. By these considerations it is intimated that the ancients, in consequence of their eminent holiness, were admitted to associate immediately with the gods, etc. And the *smṛiti* speaks of 'contact with the gods made known by sacred study,' etc. Again, when the *smṛiti* talks of devotion resulting in the acquisition of superhuman faculties such as minuteness, this assertion cannot have been made through mere audacity [*i.e.*, it must have had some good foundation]. The Veda, too, declares the immense power of devotion in these words: 'When the fivefold influence of devotion, arising in the elements of earth, water, fire, air, and ether, has begun to act, and a man has attained an ethereal [?] body, he is no longer affected by disease, decay, or death.' And it is unreasonable to estimate by the analogy of our own power, the power of the rishis, the seers of the Vedic hymns and brahmanas. Wherefore the Itihāsas and Puranas have a foundation.'"

Śankara does not, however, treat all the ancients in this way. Like many other systematizers, he finds no difficulty in rejecting or explaining away any authorities which come into conflict with his views. It is thus that he deals with Kapila, the author of the Sānkhya. That eminent sage is thus spoken of in the Svetāśvatara Upanishad v. 2: *Yo yoniṁ yonim adhitishṭhaty eko viśvāni rūpāṇi yonīścha sarvāḥ | ṛishim prasūtaṁ Kapilaṁ yas tam agre jñānair bibhartti jāyamañcha paśyet.* "The god who alone superintends every source of production and all forms, who formerly nourished with various knowledge his son the rishi Kapila, and beheld him at his birth."[50]

[50] See S'ankara's commentary on this passage in Bibl. Ind. vii. 351, and Dr. Röer's translation, p. 62, with the note; also Dr. Hall's note in pp. 18 and 19 of the preface to his edition of the Sānkhya Pravachana Bhāshya, in the Bibl. Ind.

In his comment on the Brahma Sūtras ii. 1, 1, Śankara remarks on this passage of the Upanishad as follows:—*Yā tu śrutiḥ Kapilasya jñānātiśayaṁ darśayantī pradarśitā na tayā śruti-viruddham api Kāpilam mataṁ śraddhātuṁ śakyaṁ Kapilam iti śruti-sāmānya-mātratvād anyasya cha Kapilasya sagara-putrāṇām prataptur Vāsudeva-nāmnaḥ smaraṇāt | anyārtha-darśanasya cha prāpti-rahitasya asādhakatvāt | Bhavati cha anyā Manor māhātyam prakhyāpayantī śrutir 'yad vai kiñcha Manur avadat tad bheshajam' iti | Manunā cha 'sarva-bhūteshu chātmānaṁ sarva-bhūtāni chātmani | samam paśyann ātma-yājī svārājyam adhigachchhati' iti sarvātmatva-darśanam praśaṁsatā Kāpilam mataṁ nindyate iti gamyate | Kapilo hi na sarvātmatva-darśanam anumanyate ātma-bhedābhyupagamāt | . . . . ataścha ātma-bheda-kalpanayā 'pi Kāpilasya tantrasya veda-viruddhatvaṁ vedānusāri-Manu-vachana-virudhatvañcha na kevalaṁ svatantra-prakṛiti-parikalpanayā eveti siddham* | "And the Vedic text which has been pointed out, showing the pre-eminence of Kapila's knowledge, cannot be a warrant for believing the doctrine of Kapila, though contrary to the Veda, since the word Kapila has, in this text, a general sense [applicable to others besides the author of the Sānkhya], and another Kapila called Vāsudeva, the consumer of Sagara's sons, also, is mentioned in the *smṛiti;* and since a darśana of a different import, devoid of benefit [?], has no power of proving anything. There is, besides, another text of the Veda which sets forth the eminent dignity of Manu in these terms, 'Whatever Manu said is medicine.' And Manu,—when he employs the words, 'He who, with impartial eye, beholds himself in all beings, and all beings in himself, thus sacrificing his own personality, becomes identified with the self-refulgent Being;' and, by saying this, commends the tenet that everything is one with the supreme Spirit—must be understood as censuring Kapila's doctrine. For Kapila does not assent to the identity of Brahma and the universe, for we know that he holds a diversity of souls." . . . . . (After quoting one passage from the Mahābhārata, and another from the Veda, to

prove that Kapila is wrong, Śankara proceeds): "Hence it is proved that Kapila's system is at variance with the Veda and with the words of Manu, who follows the Veda, not only in supposing an independent Prakriti (nature), but also in supposing a diversity of souls."

IV.—See also Śankara's commentary on the Taittirīya Upanishad, Bib. Ind. vii. pp. 136, 137, where he says: *Kāpila-kāṇāda-ādi-tarka-śāstra-virodha iti chet | na | teshām mūlābhāve veda-virodhe cha bhrāntyopapatteḥ |* "If it be objected that this is contrary to the rationalistic doctrines of Kapila and Kanāda [and therefore wrong], I answer no, since these doctrines are proved to be erroneous, as having no foundation, and as being in opposition to the Veda."

V.—His remarks on a passage of the Praśna Upanishad are as follows, and afford a curious specimen of the contemptuous manner in which this orthodox Vedantist treats the heretical Sānkhyas, etc. (Praśna Up. vi. 4; Bib. Ind. viii. 244):—*Sāṇkhyāstu avidyā-'dhyāropitam eva purushe karttṛitvaṁ kriyā-kārakam phalañcha iti kalpayitvā āgama-vāhyatvāt punas tatas trasyantaḥ paramārthata eva bhoktṛitvam purushasya ichchhanti | tattvāntarañcha pradhānam purushāt paramārtha-vastu-bhūtam eva kalpayanto 'nya-tārkika-kṛita-buddhi-vishayāḥ santo vihanyante | Tathā itare tārkikāḥ sāṇkhyair ity evam paraspara-viruddhārtha-kalpanāta āmishārthina iva prāṇino 'nyonyaṁ viruddhamānā artha-darśitvāt paramārtha-tattvāt taddūram eva apakṛishyante | atas tanmatam anādṛitya vedāntārtha-tattvam ekatva-darśanam prati ādaravanto mumuxavaḥ syur iti tārkika-mate dosha-darśanaṁ kiñchid uchyate 'smābhir na tu tārkika-tātparyyeṇa |* "The followers of the Sānkhya maintain that the functions of action, causation, and the enjoyment of reward become erroneously attributed to the soul (purusha) in consequence of supervening ignorance; but as this doctrine differs from that of Scripture, they become afraid of it, and seek to ascribe to the soul enjoyment in the proper sense. And imagining another principle distinct from soul, viz., Pradhāna (or nature), which they regard as

substance in the proper sense, they become the objects of criticism by other rationalists, and are crushed. In consequence of these contradictory conceptions of the Sānkhyasts, other free-thinkers again begin to quarrel with them like animals [*dogs* he would no doubt have *liked* to say] fighting for flesh; and thus, from their having some selfish object [?] in view, they are all drawn away to a distance from the essential truth. Wherefore let men, disregarding their tenets, seek for final liberation by paying honour to the principles of the Vedantic doctrine, which maintains the unity of all being. We have thus pointed out something of the errors of the rationalists, but without any reference to the rationalists personally."

VI.—In thus depreciating Kapila, Śankara is in direct opposition to the Bhāgavata Purana (which, however, is considered to be a work of later date[51]), in which the author of the Sānkhya is spoken of with the greatest reverence. Thus in Bhāg. Pur. i. 3, 10, he is described as the fifth incarnation of Vishnu. *Pañchamaḥ Kapilo nāma siddheśaḥ kāla-viplutam | provāchāsuraye sāṇkhyaṁ tattva-grāma-vinirṇayam* | "In his fifth manifestation, he [in the form of] Kapila, lord of saints, declared to Āsuri the Sānkhya which defines the collection of principles, and which had been lost through the lapse of time."

VII.—And again, in Bhāg. Pur. ix. 8, 12, 13, Kapila is made the subject of eulogy. A legend narrates that the sixty thousand sons of King Sagara, conceiving Kapila to be the robber of a horse which had been carried away from their sacrifice, advanced to slay him, when they were burnt up by fire issuing from his body. The author of the Purana, however, denies that this was in any degree owing to *passion* on the part of the sage: *Na sādhu-vādo muni-kopa-bharjitā nṛipendra-putrā iti sattva-dhāmani | kathaṁ tamo roshamayaṁ vibhāvyate jagat-pavitrātmani khe rajo bhuvaḥ | yasyeritā sāṇkhyamayī dṛiḍheha naur yayā mumuxus tarate duratyayam | bhavārṇavam mṛityupathaṁ vipaśchitaḥ parātma-bhūtasya katham pṛithagmatiḥ* | "It is not an

[51] See Wilson's Vish. Pur. pref. pp. xxviii. ff.

assertion befitting a good man to say that the king's sons were burnt up by the wrath of the sage: for how is it conceivable that the darkness (*tamas*) of anger should reside in the abode of goodness (*sattva*) and sanctifier of the world; or that the dust (*rajas*) of the earth should ascend into the sky? How could that sage by whom the strong ship of the Sānkhya was launched, on which the man seeking emancipation crosses the ocean of existence, hard to be traversed, and leading to death—how could he entertain the distinction of friend and foe [and so treat any one as an enemy]?"

It is not necessary for me to quote any further passages in praise of the author of the Sānkhya. There is a great deal about this system in the Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva, verses 11,037 ff. See Colebrooke's Essays i. 236 (p. 149 of W. and N.'s ed.); Wilson's Vishnu Purana, pref. pp. lix, lx, and text, pp. 9 ff. with notes; Bhāgavata Purana iii. chapters 24-30; Weber's Ind. Stud. passim; Dr. Röer's Introduction to Śvetāśvatara Upanishad, Bibl. Ind. xv. 35 ff.; and Dr. Hall's Sānkhya Pravachana Bhāshya, Bibl. Ind. pref. pp. 5, note, 18, note.

We have thus seen that a distinct line of demarcation is drawn by the most accurate and critical of the Indian writers, between the *śruti*, which they define to be superhuman and independent, and the *smṛiti*, which they regard as of human origin, and dependent for its authority on its conformity with the *śruti*. Śankara, indeed, as we have also observed, goes very nearly so far as to assign an independent foundation to the *smṛitis*; but he confines this distinction to such of these works as coincide in doctrine with the śruti or Veda, according to his own Vedantic interpretation of its principles, while all other speculators are denounced by him as heterodox. It is, however, clear from the Śvetāśvatara Upanishad, the Mahābhārata, the Bhagavad Gītā, the Vishnu, and the Bhāgavata Puranas, etc., that the doctrines of the Sānkhya must have been very prevalent in ancient times, and that Śankara, when he condemned them as erroneous, must have done so in the face of many powerful opponents.

It is not necessary for me here to inquire with any accuracy what the relation was in which the different philosophical systems stood to each other in former ages. It may suffice to say that the more philosophical adherents of each—of the Vedanta, the Sānkhya, the Nyāya, etc.—must, according to all appearance, have maintained their respective principles with the utmost earnestness and tenacity, and could not have admitted that any of the rival systems was superior to their own in any particular. It is impossible to study the Sūtras of the several schools, and come to any other conclusion. The more popular systems of the Puranas, on the other hand, blended various tenets of the different systems syncretically together. In modern times the superior orthodoxy of the Vedanta seems to be generally admitted. But even those who hold this opinion refuse to follow the example of Śankara in denouncing the founders of the rival schools as heretical. On the contrary, they regard them all as inspired Munis, who, by adapting their doctrines to the capacities or tendencies of different students, have paved the way for the ultimate reception of the Vedantic system. Such is the view taken in the Prasthāna-bheda of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, who thus writes (Weber's Indische Studien, i. 23): *Sarveshāñcha saṅxepeṇa trividha eva prasthāna-bhedaḥ | tatra ārambha-vāda ekaḥ | pariṇāma-vādo dvitīyaḥ | vivartta-vādas tṛitīyaḥ | pārthivāpya-taijasa-vāyavīyāś chaturvidhāḥ paramāṇavo dvyaṇukādikrameṇa brahmāṇḍa-paryantaṁ jagad ārambhante | asad eva kāryyaṁ kāraka-vyāpārād utpadyate iti prathamas tārkikāṇām mīmāṁsakānāñcha | sattva-rajas-tamo-guṇātmakam pradhānam eva mahad-ahaṅkārādi-krameṇa jagad-ākāreṇa pariṇamate | pūrvam api sūxma-rūpeṇa sad eva kāryaṁ kāraṇa-vyāpāreṇa abhivyajyate iti dvitīyaḥ paxaḥ Sāṅkhya-Yoga-Pātañjala-Pāśupatānām | Brahmaṇaḥ pariṇāmo jagad iti Vaishṇavānām | sva-prakāśa-paramānandādvitīyam Brahma sva-māyā-vaśād mithyaiva jagad-ākāreṇa kalpate iti tṛitīyaḥ paxo Brahmavādinām | sarveshām prasthāna-karttṛiṇām munīnāṁ vivarttavāda-paryavasānena advitīye Parameśvare eva pratipādye*

tātparyam | na hi te munayo bhrāntāḥ sarvaiñatvāt teshāṁ kintu vahir-vishaya-pravaṇānām āpātataḥ purushārthe praveśo na sambhavati iti nāstikya-vāraṇāya taiḥ prakāra-bhedāḥ pradarśitāḥ | tatra teshāṁ tātparyam abuddhvā veda-viruddhe 'py arthe tātparyam utprexamāṇās tan-matam eva upādeyatvena gṛihṇanto janā nānā-patha-jusho bhavanti | iti sarvam anavadyam | "The difference in principle between these various schools is, when briefly stated, three-fold. The first doctrine is that of a *commencement* of the world; the second is that of an *evolution;* the third is that of an *illusion.* The first theory, that of the logicians and Mīmānsakas, is this: atoms of four descriptions—earthy, aqueous, igneous, and atmospheric—beginning with compounds of two atoms, and ending in the egg of Brahma (the world), originate the universe: and effects *previously non-existing, come into being* from the action of a causer. The second theory, that of the Sānkhyas, Yogas, Pātanjalas, and Pāśupatas, is that *Pradhāna* (or *Prakṛiti* = nature), consisting of the three *guṇas* (qualities), *sattva, rajas,* and *tamas,* is *evolved,* through the successive stages of *mahat* (intellect), and *ahankāra* (consciousness), etc., in the form of the world; and that effects, which had *previously existed* in a subtile form, are [merely] *manifested* by the action of their cause. Another form of the theory of *evolution* is that of the Vaishnavas [the Rāmānujas], who hold the universe to be an *evolution* of Brahma. The third view, that of the Vedantists (Brahma-vādis) is, that Brahma, the self-resplendent, the supremely happy, and the one sole essence, assumes, unreally, the form of the world through the influence of his own illusion (Māyā).

The ultimate scope of all the Munis, authors of these different systems, is to support the theory of illusion, and their only design is to establish the existence of one Supreme God, the sole essence; for these Munis could not be mistaken [as some of them must have been, if they were not all of one opinion, or, as those of them must have been who did not hold Vedantic principles], *since they were omniscient. But as they saw that men, addicted*

to the pursuit of external objects, could not all at once penetrate into the highest truth, they held out to them a variety of theories, in order that they might not fall into atheism. Misunderstanding the object which the Munis thus had in view, and representing that they even designed to propound doctrines contrary to the Vedas, men have come to regard the specific doctrines of these several schools with preference, and thus become adherents of a variety of systems. Thus all has been satisfactorily stated."

The view here taken by Madhusūdana of the ultimate coincidence in principle of all the different schools of Hindu philosophy, however mutually hostile in appearance, seems, as I have remarked, to be that which is commonly entertained by modern Pandits. (See Dr. Ballantyne's Synopsis of Science, advertisement, p. iv.) This system of compromise, however, is clearly a deviation from the older doctrine; and it practically abolishes the distinction in point of authority between the Vedas and the smṛitis, Darśanas, etc. For if the Munis, authors of the six Darśanas, were omniscient and infallible, they must stand on the same level with the Vedas, which can be nothing more.

To return, however, from this discussion regarding the hostility of Śankara to the adherents of the Sānkhya and other rationalistic schools, and the opinions of later authors concerning the founders of those several systems. The distinction drawn by the Indian commentators quoted in this section between the superhuman Veda and its human appendages, the Kalpa-sūtras, etc., as well as the smṛitis, is not borne out by the texts which I have cited above (pp. 7, 18) from the Vrihad Āranyaka, and Mundaka Upanishads. By classing together the Vedic Sanhitās, and the other works enumerated in the same passages, the authors of the Upanishads seem to place them all upon an equal footing. If the one set of works are superhuman, it may fairly be argued that the others are so likewise. According to the Mundaka Upanishad, neither of them (if we except only the Vedantas or Upanishads) can be placed in the highest rank, as they equally inculcate a science which is only of secondary importance.

As, however, Śankara, in his comment on the text from the Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad, maintains that the whole of the works enumerated, excepting the Sanhitās of the four Vedas, are in reality portions of the Brahmanas, it will be necessary to quote his remarks, which are as follows (Bibl. Ind. ii. 855 ff.): . . . *Niśvasitam iva niśvasitam | yathā aprayatnenaiva purusha-niśvāso bhavaty evam vā | are kiṁ tad niśvasitaṁ tato jātam ity uchyate | Yad ṛigvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo 'tharvāṅgirasaś chaturvidham mantra-jātam | itihāsa ity Ūrvaśī-Purūravasor saṁvādādir 'Ūrvaśī ha apsarā' ityādi brāhmaṇam eva | purāṇam 'asad vā idam agre āsīd' ityādi | vidyā devajana-vidyā 'vedaḥ so 'yam' ityādiḥ | upanishadaḥ 'priyam ity etad upāsīta' ityādyāḥ | ślokā 'brāhmaṇa-prabhavā mantrās tad ete ślokā' ity ādayaḥ | sūtrāṇi vastu-saṅgraha-vākyāni vede yathā 'ātmā ity eva upāsīta' ityādīni | anuvyākhyānāni mantra-vivaraṇāni | vyākhyānāni arthavādāḥ | . . . evam ashṭavidham brāhmaṇam | evam mantra-brāhmaṇayor eva grahaṇam | niyata-rachanāvato vidyamānasyaiva vedasya abhivyaktiḥ purusha-niśvāsa-vat | nacha purusha-buddhi-prayatna-pūrvakaḥ | ataḥ pramāṇam nirapexa eva svārthe | . . . tena vedasya aprāmāṇyam āśaṅkate | tad-āśaṅkā-nivritty-artham idam uktam | purusha-niśvāsa-vad aprayatnotthitatvāt pramāṇaṁ vedo na yathā 'nyo grantha iti |* "'His breathing' means, *as it were* his breathing, or it denotes the absence of effort, as in the case of a man's breathing. We are now told what that breathing was which was produced from him. It was the four classes of mantras (hymns), those of the Rik, Yajush, Sāman, and Atharvāngirases (Ātharvana); Itihāsa (or narrative), such as the dialogue between Ūrvaśī and Purūravas, viz., the passage in the Brahmana beginning 'Ūrvaśī the Apsaras,' etc. [Ś. P. Br. p. 855]; Purana, such as 'this was originally non-existent,' etc.; Vidyā (knowledge), the knowledge of the gods, as 'this is the Veda,' etc.; Upanishads, such as 'this is beloved, let him reverence it,' etc.; Ślokas, such as those here mentioned, 'the mantras are the sources of the Brahmanas, on which subject there are these ślokas,' etc.; Sūtras (aphorisms)

occurring in the Veda which condense the substance of doctrines, as 'it is the soul, let him adore,' etc.; Anuvyākhyānas, or interpretations of the mantras; Vyakhyānas, or explanatory remarks." The commentator adds alternative explanations of the two last terms, and then proceeds: "Here, therefore, eight sorts of texts occurring in the Brahmanas are referred to; and consequently the passage before us embraces merely mantras and Brahmanas. The manifestation of the Veda, which already existed in a fixed form of composition, is compared to the breathing of a person: the Veda was not the result of effort proceeding from the conscious intelligence of any individual. Consequently, as proof in respect of itself, it is independent of everything else."

Śankara terminates his comment on this passage by intimating that the author of the Upanishad means to remove a doubt regarding the authority of the Veda, arising apparently from its unreality, if it were regarded as created by a conscious effort of Brahma, and therefore as distinct from him, the only really existing being, and concludes that "the Veda, unlike all other books, is authoritative, because it was produced without any effort of will, like a man's breathing." (See Sānkhya Sūtras, v. 50; above p. 83.)

This attempt to explain the whole of the eight classes of works enumerated in the Upanishad as nothing else than parts of the Brahmanas, cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory, since some of them, such as the Sūtras, have always been referred to a distinct class of writings, which are regarded as uninspired (see Müller's Anc. Ind. Lit. pp. 75, 86); and the Itihāsas and Puranas had in all probability become a distinct class of writings at the period when the Upanishad was composed. And Śankara's explanation is rendered more improbable if we compare with this passage the other from the Mundaka Upanishad, i. 1, 5, already quoted above (p. 18), where it is said, "the inferior science consists of the Rik, Yajush, Sāma, and Atharva Vedas, accentuation (*śixā*), ritual prescriptions (*kalpa*), grammar, commentary (*nirukta*),

prosody (*chhandas*), and astronomy."[52] Here various appendages of the Vedas, which later writers expressly distinguish from the Vedas themselves, and distinctly declare to have no superhuman authority, are yet mentioned in the same category with the four Sanhitās, or collections of the hymns, as constituting the inferior science (in opposition to the knowledge of the supreme Spirit). From this we may reasonably infer that the author of the Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad also, when he specifies the Sūtras and some of the other works which he enumerates, intended to speak of the Vedangas or appendages of the Vedas, and perhaps the smṛitis also, as being the breathing of Brahma. The works which in the passage from the Mundaka are called Kalpa, are also commonly designated as the Kalpa Sūtras.

This conclusion is in some degree confirmed by referring to the passage from the Mahābhārata Ś. P. 7,660, which has been cited in p. 73, where it is said that the "great rishis obtained by devotion the Vedas, and the *Itihāsas*, which had disappeared at the end of the preceding Yuga." Whatever may be the sense of the word *Itihāsa* in a Vedic work, there can be no doubt that in the Mahābhārata, which is itself an *Itihāsa*, the word refers to that class of metrical histories. And in this text we see these *Itihāsas* placed on a footing of equality with the Vedas, and regarded as having been, like them, pre-existent and supernatural. See also the passage from the Chhandogya Upanishad,

[52] I take the opportunity of introducing here Sāyana's remarks on this passage in his Commentary on the Rig-veda, vol. i., p. 33. *Atigambhīrasya vedasya artham avabodhayitum śixādīni shaḍ-aṅgāni pravṛittāni | ata eva teshām apara-vidyā-rūpatvam Muṇḍakopanishady Ātharvaṇikā āmananti | 'dve vidye' ityādi | . . . sādhana-bhūta-dharma-jñāna-hetutvāt shaḍ-aṅga-sahitānām karma-kāṇḍānām apara-vidyātvam | parama-purushārtha-bhūta-brahma-jñāna-hetutvād upanishadām para-vidyātvam.* "The *śixā* and other six appendages are intended to promote the comprehension of the sense of the very deep Veda. Hence, in the Mundaka Upanishad, the followers of the Atharva-veda declare that these works belong to the class of inferior sciences, thus: 'There are two sciences,' etc. [see the entire passage in p. 18.] Since the sections of the Veda which relate to ceremonies [including, of course, the hymns], as well as the six appendages, lead to a knowledge of duty, which is an instrument [of something further], they are ranked as an inferior science. On the other hand the Upanishads, which conduct to a knowledge of Brahma, the supreme object of man, constitute the highest science."

vii. 1, 1 ff. (Bibl. Ind., vol. iii., pp. 473 ff.) which will be given in the Appendix, where the Itihāsas and Puranas are spoken of as a *fifth Veda*. The same title is applied to them in the Bhāg. Pur. iii. 12, 39 : *Itihāsa-purāṇāni pañchamaṁ vedam Īśvaraḥ | sarvebhya eva mukhebhyaḥ sasṛije sarva-darśanaḥ |* "The omniscient Iśvara (God) created from all his mouths the Itihāsas and Puranas, as a *fifth Veda*."

SECT. X.—*Recapitulation of the Arguments urged in the Darśanas, and by Commentators in support of the Authority of the Vedas, with some remarks on these reasonings.*

As in the preceding sections (vi.-ix.) I have entered at some length into the arguments urged by the authors of the philosophical systems and their commentators, in proof of the eternity and infallibility of the Vedas, it may be convenient to recapitulate these reasonings, and to add such observations as the consideration of them may suggest.

The grounds on which the apologists of the Vedas rest their authority are briefly these :—First, it is urged that, like the sun, they shine by their own light, and evince an inherent power both of revealing their own perfection, and of elucidating all other things, past and future, great and small, near and remote (Sāyana, as quoted above, p. 44 ; Śankara on Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 3, above, p. 45, note 31; Sānkhya Sūtras, above, p. 84). Second, that they are not known to have had, and therefore could not have had, any human author, as the rishis merely *saw*, and did not *compose* them ; while, if they had any author, it was the deity, and as he is faultless, they could not have contracted any imperfection from being his work (Nyāya-mālā-vistara and Vedārtha-prakāśa, above, pp. 88 and 52). Third, that the language of which they are composed is eternal, and therefore they are eternal, and consequently (I presume) perfect

and infallible.[53] (Mīmānsa Sūtras and commentary; Brahma Sūtras with Śankara's commentary; above, pp. 52-73.)

These arguments suggest a few remarks. In regard to the first ground for maintaining the infallibility of the Veda, viz., the evidence which radiates from itself, or its internal evidence, I need only observe that this is a species of proof which must be judged by the reason and conscience of each individual student. This evidence may appear conclusive to men in a certain stage of their national and personal culture, and especially to those who have been accustomed from their infancy to regard the Vedas with a hereditary veneration; whilst to persons in a different state of mental progress, and living under different influences, it will appear perfectly futile. It is quite clear that, even in India itself, there existed in former ages multitudes of learned and virtuous men who were unable to see the force of this argument, and who consequently rejected the authority of the Vedas. I allude of course to Buddha and his followers. (See also Part Second, p. 180 ff., where the objections of the rationalist Kautsa are detailed.)

In regard to the second argument, viz. that the Vedas must be of divine origin, as they are not known to have had any human author, I observe as follows. The Greek historian, Herodotus, remarks (ii. 23) of a geographer of his own day who explained the annual inundations of the river Nile by supposing its stream to be derived from an imaginary ocean flowing round the earth, which no one had ever seen, that *his opinion did not admit of confutation, because he carried the discussion back into the region of the unapparent* (*ἐς ἀφανὲς τὸν μῦθον ἀνενείκας οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεγχον*). The same might be said of the Indian speculators, who argue that the Veda must have had a supernatural origin, because it was never observed to have had a human author like other books;—that by thus removing the

[53] In the Vrihad Aranyaka Upanishad (p. 688 of Dr. Röer's ed.) it is said: *Vāchaiva samrāḍ Brahma jñāyate vāg vai samrāṭ paramam Brahma.* "By speech, o monarch, Brahma is known. Speech is the supreme Brahma."

negative grounds on which they rest their case into the unknown depths of antiquity, they do their utmost to place themselves beyond the reach of direct refutation. But it is to be observed (1) that, even if it were to be admitted that no human authors of the Vedas were remembered in later ages, this would prove nothing more than their antiquity, and that it would still be incumbent on their apologists to show that this circumstance necessarily involved their supernatural character; and (2) that, in point of fact, Indian tradition does point to certain rishis or bards as the authors of the Vedic hymns. It is true, indeed, as has been already noticed (p. 90), that these rishis are said to have only *seen* the hymns, which (it is alleged) were eternally pre-existent, and that they were not their authors. But as it appears to be shown by tradition that the hymns were uttered by such and such rishis, how is it *proved* that these rishis were not uttering the mere productions of their own minds? The whole character of these compositions, and the circumstances under which they appear to have arisen, are in harmony with the supposition that they were nothing more than the natural expression of the personal hopes and feelings of those ancient bards from whom they proceeded. In these songs the Arian sages celebrated the praises of their ancestral gods (while at the same time they sought to conciliate their goodwill by a variety of acceptable oblations), and besought of them all the blessings which men in general desire—health, wealth, long life, cattle, offspring, victory over their enemies, and in some cases also, forgiveness of sin and celestial felicity.

The scope of these hymns is well summed up in the passage which I have already quoted in Part Second, p. 206. "The rishis desiring [various] objects, hastened to the gods with metrical prayers." The Nirukta, quoted in the same place, says: "Each particular hymn has for its deity the god to whom the rishi, *seeking to obtain any object of desire which he longs for*, addresses his prayer."

And in the continuation of the same passage from the Nirukta (vii. 3), the fact that the hymns express the different feelings or

objects of the rishis is distinctly recognized:—*Paroxa-kritāḥ pratyaxa-kritāścha mantrā bhūyishṭhā alpaśa ādhyātmikāḥ | athāpi stutir eva bhavati na āśīrvāda 'Indrasya nu vīryāṇi pravocham' iti yathā etasmin sūkte | athāpi āsīr eva na stutiḥ 'suchaxā aham axībhyām bhūyāsaṁ suvarchā mukhena suśrut karṇābhyām bhūyāsam' iti | tad etad bahulam ādhvaryave yājñeshu cha mantreshu | athāpi śapathābhiśāpau | 'adyā murīya' ityādi... athāpi kasyachid bhāvasya āchikhyāsā | 'na mṛityur āsīd' ityādi... | athāpi paridevanā kasmāchchid bhāvāt | 'sudevo adya prapated anāvṛid' ityādi | athāpi nindā-praśaṁse | 'kevalāgho bhavati kevalādī' ityādi | evam axa-sūkte dyūta-nindā cha kṛishi-praśaṁsā cha || evam uchchāvachair abhiprāyair ṛishīṇām mantra-dṛishtayo bhavanti |* "[Of the three kinds of verses specified in the preceding section] those which address a god as absent, and those which address him as present, are the most numerous, while those which are addressed to the speaker himself [or the soul] are rare. It happens also that a god is praised without any blessing being invoked, as in the hymn (R. V. i. 32). 'I declare the heroic deeds of Indra,' etc. Again, blessings are invoked without any praise being offered, as in the words, 'May I see well with my eyes, have a handsome face, and hear well with my ears.' This frequently occurs in the Ādhvaryava (Yajur) Veda, and in the sacrificial formulæ. Then again we find oaths and curses, as in the words, (R. V. vii. 104, 15), 'May I die to-day, if I am a *yātudhāna*,' etc. (See Part First, p. 132). Further, we observe the desire to describe some particular state of things, as in the verse (R. V. x. 129, 2) 'Death was not then, nor immortality,' etc. Then there is lamentation, as in the verse (R. V. x. 95, 14), 'The beautiful god will disappear and never return,' etc. Again, we have blame and praise, as in the words (R. V. x. 117, 6), 'The man who eats alone, bears the blame alone,' etc. So too in the hymn to dice (R. V. x. 34, 13), there is a censure upon dice, and a commendation of agriculture. *Thus the objects for which the hymns were seen by the rishis were very various.*"

It is to be observed, however, that though in this passage the author, Yāska, speaks of the various desires which the rishis expressed in different hymns, he nevertheless adheres to the idea which was recognized in his age, and in which he doubtless participated, that the rishis *saw* the hymns.

I may also refer to the passage quoted from the Nirukta x. 42, in Part Second, pp. 391, 392, note, where the form of the metre in particular hymns appears to be ascribed to the peculiar genius of the rishi Paruchhepa.

In Nirukta iii. 11 a similar manner of regarding the rishi Kutsa is ascribed to the interpreter Aupamanyava: *Ṛishiḥ Kutso bhavati karttā stomānām ity Aupamanyavaḥ* | "'Kutsa is the name of a rishi, a maker of hymns,' as Aupamanyava thinks."

I do not, as I have already intimated, quote these passages of the Nirukta to show that the author regarded the hymns as the ordinary productions of the rishis' own minds, for this would be at variance with the expression "*seeing*," which he applies to the mental act by which they were created. It appears also from the terms in which he speaks of the rishis in the passage (Nirukta i. 20) quoted in p. 174 of the Second Part, where they are described as having an intuitive insight into duty, that he placed them on a far higher level than the inferior men of later ages. But it is clear that Yāska recognizes the hymns as being applicable to the particular circumstances in which the rishis were placed, and as being the *bonâ fide* expression of their individual emotions and desires. (See also Nirukta ii. 10 and 24, quoted in Part First, pp. 143, 144, and 124.) But if this be true, the supposition that these hymns, *i.e.*, hymns suited to declare the different feelings and wishes of all the different rishis, were eternally pre-existent, and were perceived by them at the precise conjunctures when they were required to express their several aims, is perfectly gratuitous and unnecessary, (and involves what Indian logicians call a *gaurava*).

In regard to the third argument for the authority of the Vedas, viz., that they are eternal, because the words of which

they are composed are eternal, and because these words have an inherent and eternal (and not a merely conventional) connection with the significations or objects, or the *species* of objects, which they represent, it is to be observed that it is rejected both by the Nyāya and Sānkhya schools.[54] And I am unable (if I rightly comprehend this orthodox reasoning) to see how it proves the authority of the Veda more than that of any other book. If the words of the Veda are eternal, so must those of the Bauddha books be eternal, and consequently the perfection and infallibility of these heretical works must be as much proved by this argument as the divine origin of the Vedas, whose pretensions they reject and oppose.

Against the eternity of the Vedas an objection has been raised, which Jaimini considers it necessary to notice, viz., that various historical personages are named in their pages, and that as these works could not have existed before the persons whose doings they record, they must have commenced to exist in time. This difficulty Jaimini attempts, as we have seen above (pp. 61, 63), to meet by explaining away the names of the historical personages in question. Thus Babara Prāvahini is said to be nothing else than an appellation of the wind, which is eternal. And this method, it is said, is to be applied in all similar cases. Another of the passages mentioned by an objector (see above, p. 62) as referring to non-eternal objects is R. V. iii. 53, 14, "What are the cows doing among the Kīkatas?" etc. The author of the Mīmānsa Sūtras would perhaps attempt to show that by these Kīkatas we are to understand some eternally pre-existing beings. But Yāska, the author of the Nirukta, who had not been instructed in any such subtleties, speaks of the Kīkatas as a non-Aryan nation. (Part Second, p. 362.) It is difficult to suppose that Jaimini—unless he was an enthusiast, and not the cool and acute reasoner he has commonly proved himself to be—could have seriously supposed that this

[54] See Dr. Ballantyne's remarks on this controversy, in pp. 186, 189, 191 and 192 of his "Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy."

rule of interpretation could ever be generally received or carried out. The Brahmanas evidently intend to represent numerous occurrences which they narrate, as having actually taken place in time, and the actors in them as having been real historical personages. See, for instance, the two legends from the Śatapatha Brahmana, quoted in the Second Part of this work, pp. 324 and 419. And it is impossible to peruse the Vedic hymns without coming to the conclusion that they also record a multitude of events, which the writers believed to have been transacted by men on earth in former ages. (See the passages quoted from the Rig-veda in the First and Second Parts of this work, passim; those, for example, in Part Second, p. 208.)

We shall, no doubt, be assisted in arriving at a correct conclusion in regard to the real origin and character of the hymns of the Veda, if we enquire what opinion the rishis, by whom they were confessedly spoken, entertained of their own utterances; and this I propose to investigate in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISHIS, AND THEIR OPINIONS IN REGARD TO THE ORIGIN OF THE VEDIC HYMNS.

I HAVE already shewn, in the preceding pages, as well as in Part Second of this work, that the hymns of the Rig-veda themselves supply us with numerous data by which we can judge of the circumstances to which they owed their origin, and of the manner in which they were created. We have seen that they were the natural product and expression of the particular state of society, of the peculiar religious conceptions, and of all those other influences, physical and moral, which prevailed at the period when they were composed, and acted upon the minds of their authors. (Part Second, pp. 205 ff; and above, pp. 109 ff.) We find in them ideas, a language, a spirit, and a colouring totally different from those which characterize the religious writings of the Hindus of a later era. They frequently discover to us the simple germs from which mythological legends current in subsequent ages were derived,—germs which in many cases were developed in so fanciful and extravagant a manner as to prove that the correct tradition had long before disappeared, and that the lost details have been replaced by pure fictions of the imagination. They afford us very distinct indications of the locality in which they were composed (Part Second, pp. 354-372); they shew us the Arian tribes living in a state of warfare with surrounding enemies (many of them, no doubt, alien in race and language), and gradually, as we may infer, forcing their way onward to the east and south (Part Second, pp. 374 ff., 384 ff., 414 ff.); they supply us with numerous specimens of the par-

ticular sorts of prayers, viz., for protection and victory, which men so circumstanced would naturally address to the gods whom they worshipped, as well as of those more common supplications which men in general offer up for the various blessings which constitute the sum of human welfare; and they bring before us as the objects of existing veneration a class of deities (principally, if not exclusively, personifications of the elements, and of the powers either of nature, or of reason) who gradually lost their importance in the estimation of the later Indians, and made way for gods of a different description, invested with new attributes, and in many cases bearing new appellations.

These peculiarities of the hymns, combined with the archaic forms of the dialect in which they are composed, and the references which are made to them, as pre-existent, in the liturgical works by which they are expounded and applied, abundantly justify us in regarding them as the most ancient of all the Indian Scriptures,—as well as the natural product and the spontaneous representation of the ideas, feelings, and aspirations of the bards from whom they emanated.

We can also, as I have shewn, discover from the Vedic hymns themselves, that some of them were newer and others older, that they were the works of many successive generations of poets, that their composition probably extended over several centuries, and that in some places their authors represent them as being the productions of their own minds, while in other passages they appear to ascribe to their own words a certain divine character, or attribute their composition to some supernatural assistance. (Part Second, pp. 206 ff., 219 ff.)

I shall now proceed to adduce further proofs from the hymns of the Rig-veda in support of these last mentioned positions; repeating, at the same time, for the sake of completeness, the texts which I have already cited in the Second Part.

SECT. I.—*Passages from the Hymns of the Veda which distinguish between the Rishis as Ancient and Modern.*

The appellations or epithets applied by the authors of the hymns to themselves, and to the sages who in former times had instituted, as well as to their contemporaries who continued to conduct, the different rites of divine worship, are the following: *ṛishi, kavi, medhāvin, vipra, vipaśchit, vedhas, dīrghaśrut, muni,* etc. The rishis are defined in Boehtlingk and Roth's lexicon, to be persons "who, whether singly or in chorus, either on their own behalf or on behalf of others, invoked the gods in artificial language, and in song;" and the word is said to denote especially "the priestly bards who made this art their profession." The word *kavi* means "wise," or "a poet," and has ordinarily the latter sense in modern Sanskrit. *Vipra* means "wise," and in later Sanskrit a "Brahman." *Medhāvin* means "intelligent;" *vipaśchit* and *vedhas*, "wise" or "learned;" and *dīrgha-śrut*, a "man who has heard much." *Muni* signifies in modern Sanskrit a "sage" or devotee." It is not much used in the Rig-veda, but occurs in viii. 17, 13 (Part Second, p. 397).

The following passages from the Rig-veda either expressly distinguish between contemporary rishis and those of a more ancient date, or, at any rate, make reference to the one or the other class. This recognition of a succession of rishis constitutes one of the *historical* elements in the Veda. It is an acknowledgment on the part of the rishis themselves that numerous persons had existed, and events occurred, anterior to their own age, and, consequently, *in time;* and it therefore refutes, by the testimony of the Veda itself, the assertion of Jaimini (above, pp. 60-63, and 112) that none but eternally pre-existing objects are mentioned in that book.

If, under this and other heads of my inquiry, I have cited a larger number of passages than might have appeared to be necessary, it has been done with the intention of showing that

abundant evidence of my various positions can be adduced from all parts of the Hymn-collection.

R. V. i. 1, 2.—*Agniḥ pūrvebhir ṛishibhir īḍyo nūtanair uta | sa devān eha vaxati* | "Agni, who is worthy to be celebrated by former, as well as modern rishis, will bring the gods hither."

The word *pūrvebhiḥ* is explained by Sāyana thus: *Purātanair Bhṛigv-aṅgiraḥ-prabhṛitibhir ṛishibhiḥ* | "By the ancient rishis, Bhṛigu, Angiras," etc.; and *nūtanaiḥ* is interpreted by *idānīntanair asmābhir api*, "by us of the present day also."

R. V. i. 48, 14.—*Ye chid hi tvām ṛishayaḥ pūrve ūtaye juhūre ityādi* | "The former rishis who invoked thee for succour," etc.

R. V. i. 80, 16.—*Yām Atharvā Manush pitā Dadhyaṇ dhiyam atnata | tasmin brahmāṇi pūrvathā Indre ukthā samagmata ityādi* | "In the ceremony [or hymn] which Atharvan, or our father Manu, or Dadhyanch performed, the prayers and praises were, as of old, congregated in that Indra," etc.

R. V. i. 118, 3 (repeated in R. V. iii. 58, 3).— . . . *Āhur viprāsaḥ Aśvinā purājaḥ* | "O Aśvins, the ancient sages say," etc.

R. V. i. 131, 6.— . . . *Ā me asya vedhaso navīyaso manma śrudhi navīyasaḥ* | "Hear the hymn of me this modern sage, of this modern [sage]."

R. V. i. 139, 9.—*Dadhyaṇ ha me janusham pūrvo Angiraḥ Priyamedhāḥ Kaṇvo Atrir Manur vidur ityādi* | "The ancient Dadhyanch, Angiras, Priyamedhas, Kanva, Atri, and Manu know my birth."

R. V. i. 175, 6.—*Yathā pūrvebhyo jaritṛibhya Indra maya iva āpo na tṛishyate babhūtha | Tām anu tvā nividaṁ johāvīmi ityādi* | "Indra, as thou hast been like a joy to former worshippers, like waters to the thirsty, I invoke thee again and again with this hymn," etc.

R. V. iv. 20, 5.—*Vi yo rarapśe ṛishibhir navebhir vṛixo na pakvaḥ sṛiṇyo na jetā | . . . achhā vivakmi puruhūtam Indram* | "I call upon that Indra, invoked by many, who, like a ripe tree, like a conqueror expert in arms, has been celebrated by recent rishis."

R. V. iv. 50, 1.—*Tam pratnāsa ṛishayo dīdhyānāḥ puro viprā dadhire mandra-jihvam* | "The ancient rishis, resplendent and sage, have placed in front of them Bṛihaspati with gladdening tongue."

R. V. v. 42, 6.— . . . *Na te pūrve Maghavan na aparāso na vīryaṁ nūtanaḥ kaśchana āpa* | "Neither the ancients nor later men, nor any modern man, has attained to [conceived] thy heroism, o Maghavan."

R. V. x. 54, 3.—*Ke u nu te mahimanaḥ samasya asmat pūrve ṛishayo antam āpuḥ* | "Who among the rishis who were before us have attained to the end of all thy greatness?"

R. V. vi. 19, 4.—*Yathā chit pūrve jaritāra āsur anedyā anavadyā arishṭāḥ* | "As [Indra's] former worshippers were, [may we be] blameless, irreproachable, and unharmed."

R. V. vi. 21, 5.—*Idā hi te vevishataḥ purājāḥ pratnāsa āsuḥ purukṛit sakhāyaḥ* | *Ye madhyamāsa uta nūtanāsa utāvamasya puruhūta bodhi* | "For here, o energetic god, the ancients born of old, have been the friends of thee, who didst often approach them; and so too were the men of the middle and later ages. O much-invoked, think of the most recent of all."[1]

R. V. vi. 21, 8.—*Sa tu śrudhi Indra nūtanasya brahmaṇyato vīra kārudhāyaḥ* | "Heroic Indra, supporting the poet, listen to the modern [bard] who wishes to celebrate thee."

R. V. vi. 22, 2.—*Tam u naḥ pūrve pitaro navagvāḥ sapta viprāsaḥ abhi vājayantaḥ ityādi* | "Him (Indra) our ancient fathers, the seven sages, desiring food, celebrated, performing the nine-months' rite," etc.

R. V. vi. 50, 15.—*Evā napāto mama tasya dhībhir Bharadvājā abhyarchanti arkaiḥ* | "Thus do the Bharadvājas my grandsons adore thee with hymns and praises."

R. V. vii. 18, 1.—*Tve ha yat pitaraś chid naḥ Indra viśvā vāmā jaritāro asanvann ityādi* | "Since, in thee, o Indra, our fathers, thy worshippers, attained all riches," etc.

R. V. vii. 29, 4.—*Uto gha te purushyā id āsan eshām pūr-*

[1] This verse is translated in Benfey's Glossary to the Sāma-veda, p. 76, col. i.

veshām aśriṇor ṛishīṇām | adhā aham tvā Maghavan johavīmi tvaṁ naḥ Indra asi pramatiḥ piteva | "They were men who understood thy prowess: thou didst hear those former rishis. I invoke thee again and again, o Maghavan; thou art to us wise as a father." (The word *purushya* does not occur in any dictionary to which I have access. I have followed M. Langlois in giving the sense as above.)

R. V. vii. 53, 1.— . . . *Te chid hi pūrve kavayo gṛiṇantaḥ puro mahī dadhire devaputre* | "The ancient poets, celebrating their praises, have placed before them these two great [beings, heaven and earth] of whom the gods are the children."

R. V. vii. 76, 4.—*Te id devānāṁ sadhamādaḥ āsann ṛitāvānaḥ kavayaḥ pūrvyāsaḥ | gūḷhaṁ jyotiḥ pitaro anvavindan satyamantrā ajanayann ushasam* | "They were the delight [?] of the gods, those ancient pious sages. Our fathers discovered the hidden light; with true hymns they caused the dawn to arise."

R. V. vii. 91, 1.—*Kuvid aṅga namasā ye vṛidhāsaḥ purā devāsaḥ anavadyāsa āsan | te Vāyave Manave bādhitāya avāsayann*[2] *ushasaṁ sūryeṇa* | "Those gods who formerly grew through reverence were altogether blameless. They caused the dawn to rise and the sun to shine for Vāyu and the afflicted Manu." (Are we to understand *rishis* by the word *devāḥ* (gods) which is employed here?)

R. V. viii. 36, 7.—*Śyāvāśvasya sunvatas tathā śṛiṇu yathā aśriṇor Atreḥ karmāṇi kṛiṇvataḥ* | "Listen to Śyāvāśva pouring forth libations, in the same way as thou didst listen to Atri when he celebrated sacred rites."

R. V. ix. 96, 11.—*Tvayā hi naḥ pitaraḥ Soma pūrve karmāṇi chakruḥ pavamāna dhīrāḥ* | "For through thee, o pure Soma, our wise forefathers of old performed their sacred rites."

R. V. ix. 110, 7.—*Tve Soma prathamā vṛikta-varhisho mahe vājāya śravase dhiyaṁ dadhuḥ* | "The former [priests] having strewed the sacred grass, offered up a hymn to thee, o Soma, for great strength and food."

[2] See Benfey's Glossary to Sāma-veda, under the word *vas* 2.

R. V. x. 14, 15 (= A. V. xviii. 2, 2).—*Idaṁ nama ṛishibhyaḥ pūrvajebhyaḥ pūrvebhyaḥ pathikṛidbhyaḥ* | "This reverence to the rishis, born of old, the ancients, who shewed us the road." (This verse may also be employed to prove that at the end of the Vedic period the rishis had become objects of veneration.)

R. V. x. 56, 14.—*Vasishṭhāsaḥ pitṛivad vācham akrata devān īḷānā ṛishivad* | *ityādi* | "The Vasishthas, like the forefathers, like the rishis, have uttered their voice, worshipping the gods."

R. V. x. 96, 5.—*Tvam aharyathā upastutaḥ pūrvebhir Indra harikeśa yajvabhiḥ* | "Indra, with golden hair, thou didst rejoice, when lauded by the ancient priests."

R. V. x. 98, 9.—*Tvām pūrve ṛishayo gīrbhir āyan tvām adhvareshu puruhūta viśve* | "To thee the former rishis resorted with their hymns; to thee, thou much invoked, all men [resorted] at the sacrifices."

Vājasaneyi Samhitā, xviii. 5, 2.—*Imau te paxāv ajarau patatriṇau yābhyāṁ raxāṁsi apahaṁsi Agne* | *tābhyām patema sukṛitām u lokaṁ yatra ṛishayo jagmuḥ prathamajāḥ purāṇāḥ* | "But these undecaying, soaring pinions, with which, o Agni, thou slayest the Raxases,—with them let us ascend to the world of the righteous, whither the earliest-born ancient rishis have gone." (This verse is quoted in the Śatapatha Brahmana, ix. 4, 4, 4, p. 739.)

The ancient rishis, as Sāyana says in his note on R. V. i. 2, were Bhrigu, Angiras, and others whom he does not name. In another place we find Atharvan, Manu, Dadhyanch, and others mentioned. I will not attempt to give any critical account of these ancient sages. For some texts relating to Bhrigu, I may refer to the First Part of this work, p. 152 ff.; and some passages relating to Manu will be found in the Second Part, pp. 324-332. In regard to Atharvan, as well as Angiras, Prof. Goldstücker's Sanskrit and English Dictionary, and in regard to the same personages and Dadhyanch, the Sanskrit and German Lexicon of Boehtlingk and Roth, may be consulted.

SECT. II.—*Passages from the Veda in which a distinction is drawn between the older and the more recent hymns.*

From the passages which I propose to bring forward in the present section, it will be found that the hymns which the rishis addressed to the gods are frequently spoken of as new, while others of ancient date are also sometimes mentioned. The rishis no doubt entertained the idea that the gods would be more highly gratified if their praises were celebrated in new, and perhaps more elaborate and beautiful compositions, than if older and possibly ruder, prayers had been repeated.

The fact that a hymn is called *new* by its author, does not, however, by any means enable us to determine its age relatively to that of other hymns in the collection, for this epithet of new is, as we shall see, applied to numerous compositions throughout the Veda; and even when a hymn is not designated as new, it may, nevertheless, be in reality of recent date, compared with the others by which it is surrounded. When, however, any rishi characterizes his own effusion as new, we are of course necessarily led to conclude that he was acquainted with many older songs of the same kind. The relative ages of the different hymns can only be settled by means of the internal evidence furnished by their dialect, style, metre, ideas, and general contents; and we may, no doubt, hope that much will by degrees be done by the researches of critical scholars towards such a chronological classification of the constituent portions of the Rig-veda.

The hymns, praises, or prayers uttered by the rishis are called by a great variety of names, such as *ṛich, sāman, yajush, brahman, arka, uktha, sūkta, mantra, manman, mati, manīshā, sumati, dhī, dhīti, dhishaṇā, stoma, stuti, sushṭuti, praśasti, śaṁsa, gir, vāch, vachas, nītha, nivid*, etc.

R. V. i. 12, 11.—*Sa naḥ stavāna ābhara gāyatreṇa navīyasā | rayiṁ vīravatīm isham* | "Glorified by our newest hymn, do thou bring to us wealth and food with progeny." (Sāyana

explains *navīyasā* by *pūrvakair apy asampāditena gāyatreṇa* | "A hymn not formed even by former rishis.")

R. V. i. 27, 4.—*Imam ū shu tvam asmākaṁ saniṁ gāyatraṁ navyāṁsam | Agne deveshu pravochaḥ* | "Agni, thou hast announced [or do thou announce] among the gods this our offering, our newest hymn."

R. V. i. 60, 3.—*Taṁ navyasī hṛida ā jāyamānam asmat-sukīrttir madhu-jihvam aśyāḥ | yam ṛitvijo vṛijane mānushāsaḥ prayasvanta āyavo jījananta* | "May our newest laudation reach thee, the sweet tongued, who art produced from the heart, whom mortal priests the descendants of Manu, offering oblations, have generated in battle."

R. V. i. 89, 3.—*Tān pūrvayā nividā hūmahe vayam Bhagam Mitram Aditiṁ Daxam Asridham ityādi* | "We invoke with an ancient hymn Bhaga, Mitra, Aditi, Daxa, Asridh [or the friendly]," etc. (*Pūrvakālīnayā | nityayā | nividā | vedātmikayā vāchā* | "With an ancient—eternal, hymn—a Vedic text." Sāyana.)

R. V. i. 96, 2.—*Sa pūrvayā nividā kavyatā Āyor imāḥ prajā ajanayad manūnām* | "Through the ancient laudatory hymn of Āyu he generated these children of the Manus."

R. V. i. 130, 10.—*Sa no navyebhir vṛishakarmann ukthais purāṁ darttaḥ pāyubhiḥ pāhi śagmaiḥ* | "Through our new hymns, do thou, showerer of favours, destroyer of cities, sustain us with invigorating blessings."

R. V. i. 143, 1.—*Pra tavyasīṁ navyasīṁ dhītim Agnaye vācho matiṁ sahasaḥ sūnave bhare* | "I bring to Agni, the son of strength, a new and energetic hymn, a vocal celebration."

R. V. ii. 17, 1.—*Tad asmai navyam Aṅgiras-vad archata ityādi* | "Utter to him [Indra] that new [hymn] like the Angirases." ("New, *i.e.*, never before seen among other people." *anyeshv adṛishṭa-pūrvam* | Sāyana.)

R. V. ii. 24, 1.—*Sa imām aviddhi prabhṛitiṁ ya īśishe | ayā vidhema navayā mahā girā* | "Do thou who rulest receive this, our offering [of praise]: let us worship thee with this new and grand song."

R. V. iii. 1, 20.—*Etā te Agne janimā sanāni pra pūrvyāya nūtanāni vocham* | "These ancient [and yet] new productions I have uttered to thee, Agni, who art ancient." (Comp. R. V. viii. 84, 5, in the next section.)

R. V. iii. 32, 13.—*Yaḥ stomebhir vāvṛidhe pūrvyebhir yo madhyamebhir uta nūtanebhiḥ* | "[Indra] who has grown through ancient, middle, and modern hymns."

R. V. iii. 39, 1.—*Indram matir hṛida ā vachyamānā achhā patiṁ stoma-tashṭā jigāti* | *ā jāgṛivir vidathe śasyamānā Indra yat te jāyate viddhi tasya* | 2. *divaśchid ā pūrvyā jāyamānā vi jāgṛivir vidathe śasyamānā* | *bhadrā vastrāṇi arjunā vasānā sā iyam asme sanajā pitryā dhīḥ* | "1. The song, fabricated by the bard, and uttered from the heart, proceeds to Indra the lord; it arouses him when chaunted at the sacrifice: be cognizant, Indra, of this [praise] which is produced for thee. 2. Produced before the dawn, arousing thee when chaunted at the sacrifice, clothed in beautiful and radiant garments,—this is our ancient ancestral hymn." (*Pitryā* is rendered by Sāyana as *pitṛi-kramāgatā*, "received by succession from our fathers.")

R. V. iii. 62, 7.—*Iyaṁ te Pūshann āghriṇe sushṭutir deva navyasī* | *asmābhis tubhyaṁ śasyate* | "Divine and glowing Pūshan, this new laudation is uttered by us to thee."

R. V. v. 42, 13.—*Pra sū mahe suśaraṇāya medhāṁ giram bhare navyasīṁ jāyamanām* | "I present to the mighty protector a mental production, a new utterance [now] springing up."

R. V. v. 55, 8.—*Yat pūrvyam Maruto yachcha nūtanaṁ yad udyate Vasavo yachcha śasyate* | *viśvasya tasya bhavathā navedasaḥ* | "Be cognizant of all that is ancient, Maruts, and of all that is modern, of all that is spoken, Vasus, and of all that is sung."

R. V. vi. 17, 13.— . . . *Suvīram tvā svāyudhaṁ suvajram ā brahma navyam avase vavṛityāt* | "May the new prayer impel thee, the heroic, well-accoutred thunderer, to succour us." ("New, *i.e.*, never made before by others: prayer, *i.e.*, the hymn made by us." *Nūtanam anyair akṛita-pūrvam* | *brahma asmābhiḥ kṛitaṁ stotram* | Sāyana.)

R. V. vi 22, 7.—*Taṁ vo dhiyā navyasyā śavishṭham pratnam pratnavat paritaṁsayadhyai* | "I seek, like the ancients, to stimulate thee, the ancient, with a new hymn."

R. V. vi. 34. 1.—*Sañcha tve jagmur gira Indra pūrvīr vi cha tvad yanti vibhvo manīshāḥ* | *purā nūnañcha stutaya ṛishīṇām paspṛidhre Indre adhi ukthārkāḥ* | "Many prayers, Indra, are collected in thee; numerous hymns issue forth from thee; both before and now the praises, texts and hymns of rishis have hastened emulously to Indra."

R. V. vi. 44, 13.—*Yaḥ pūrvyābhir uta nūtanābhir gīrbhir vāvṛidhe griṇatām ṛishīnām* | "He (Indra) who grew through the ancient and modern hymns of adoring rishis." (See R. V. iii. 32, 13, above p. 123.)

R. V. vi. 48, 11.—*Ā sakhāyaḥ subardughāṁ dhenum ajadhvam upa navyasā vachaḥ* | "Friends, bring hither the milch cow with a new hymn."

R. V. vi. 49, 1.—*Stushe janaṁ suvrataṁ navyasībhir gīrbhir Mitrāvaruṇā sumnayantā* | "With new praises I celebrate the holy race, with Mitra and Varuna, the beneficent." ("The holy race, *i.e.*, the divine race, the company of the gods," *sukarmāṇaṁ janaṁ daivyaṁ janaṁ deva-saṇgham* | Sāyana.)

R. V. vi. 50, 6.—*Abhi tyaṁ vīraṁ girvaṇasam archa Indram brahmaṇā jaritar navena* | "Invoke, o worshipper, with a new hymn, the heroic Indra, who delights in praise."

R. V. vi. 62, 4.—*Tā navyaso jaramāṇasya manma upa bhūshato yuyujānasaptī ityādi* | 5. *Tā valgū dasrā puruśākatamā pratnā navyasā vachasā vivāse* | 4. "These (Aśvins), with yoked horses, approach the hymn of their new worshipper.". . . 5. I adore with a new hymn these brilliant, ancient, and most mighty deliverers."

R. V. vii. 53, 2.—*Pra pūrvaje pitarā navyasībhir gīrbhiḥ kṛiṇudhvam sadane ṛitasya ityādi* | "In the place of sacrifice propitiate with new hymns the ancient, the parents," etc.

R. V. vii. 56, 23.—*Bhūri chakra Marutaḥ pitryāṇi ukthāni*

yā vaḥ śasyante purā chit | "Ye have done great things, o Maruts, when our fathers' hymns were sung of old in your honour."

R. V. vii. 59, 4.— . . . *abhi va āvartt sumatir navīyasī ityādi* | "The new hymn has been directed to you."

R. V. vii. 61, 6.— . . . *Pra vām manmāni ṛichase navāni kritāni brahma jujushann imāni* | "May the new hymns *made* in your honour, may these prayers gratify you."

R. V. vii. 93, 1.—*Śuchiṁ nu stomaṁ nava-jātam adya Indrāgnī Vṛittra-hanā jushetham* | *ubhā hi vāṁ suhavā johavīmi ityādi* | "Indra and Agni, slayers of Vṛittra, receive with favour the pure hymn newly produced to-day. For again and again do I invoke you who lend a willing ear," etc.

R. V. viii. 5, 24.—*Tābhir āyātam ūtibhir navyasībhiḥ suśastibhir yad vāṁ vṛishaṇvasū have* | "Come with those same succours, since I invoke you, bountiful [deities], with new praises." (The epithet *navyasībhiḥ* in this text may possibly apply to the word *ūtibhiḥ*, "aids.")

R. V. viii. 6, 11.—*Aham pratnena manmanā giraḥ śumbhāmi Kaṇva-vat yena Indraḥ śushmam id dadhe* | "I decorate my praises with an ancient hymn, after the manner of Kanva, whereby Indra put on strength."

R. V. viii. 6, 43.—*Imāṁ su pūrvyām dhiyam madhor ghṛitasya pipyushīṁ Kaṇvā ukthena vavṛidhuḥ* | "The Kanvas with their praises have augmented this ancient hymn, replenished with sweet butter."

R. V. viii. 12, 10.—*Iyaṁ te ṛitviyāvatī dhītir eti navīyasī saparyantī ityādi* | "This new and solemn hymn advances to honour thee," etc.

R. V. viii. 20, 19.—*Yūnaḥ ū su navishṭhayā vṛishṇaḥ pāvakān abhi Sobhare girā* | *gāya ityādi* | "Celebrate, Sobhari, with a new hymn these youthful [gods] who shower down benefits and purify us."

R. V. viii. 23, 14.—*Śrushṭī Agne navasya me stomasya vīra viśpate vi māyinas tapushā raxaso daha* | "Heroic Agni, lord

of the people, listening [?] to my new hymn, burn up with thy heat the deluding Raxases."

R. V. viii. 25, 24.—*Kaśāvantā viprā navishṭhayā matī maho vājināv arvantā sachā asanam* | "I have celebrated at once with a new hymn, these sage and mighty [princes], strong, swift, and carrying whips."

R. V. viii. 39, 6.— . . . *Agnir veda marttānām apīchyam . . . Agnir dvārā vyūrṇute svāhuto navīyasā* | "Agni knows the secrets of mortals . . . Agni, invoked by a new [hymn], opens the doors."

R. V. viii. 40, 12.—*Eva Indrāgnibhyām pitṛivad navīyo Māndhātṛivad Aṅgirasvad avāchi ityādi* | "Thus has a new [hymn] been uttered to Indra and Agni after the manner of our fathers, and of Māndhātṛi, and of Angiras."

R. V. viii. 41, 2.—*Tam ū shu samanā girā pitṛīṇāñcha manmabhir Nābhākasya praśastibhiḥ* | *yaḥ sindhūnām upa udaye sapta-svasā sa madhyamaḥ* | "[Worship] him (Varuna) at once with a song, with the hymns of the fathers, and with the praises of Nābhāka. He who dwells at the birth-place of the streams, the lord of the seven sisters, abides in the centre." (This verse is quoted in the Nirukta x. 5. Nābhāka is said by Yāska to have been a rishi (*ṛishir Nābhāko babhūva*). A translation of the passage is given in Roth's Illustrations of the Nir. p. 135, where reference is also made to two verses of the preceding hymn (viii. 40, 4, 5), in which Nābhāka (the ancestor of Nābhāka) is mentioned thus: (verse 4) *Abhyarcha Nābhāka-vad Indragnī yajasā girā* . . . (verse 5) *Pra brahmāṇi Nābhāka-vad Indrāgnibhyām irajyata* | "Worship Indra and Agni with sacrifice and hymn, like Nābhāka . . . Like Nābhāka, direct your prayers to Indra and Agni." In explanation of the seven sisters, Roth refers to Nir. v. 27 (R. V. viii. 58, 12) where the seven rivers are mentioned. See his Illustrations of Nir. pp. 70, 71.

R. V. viii. 44, 12.—*Agniḥ pratnena manmanā śumbhānas tanvaṁ svām kaviḥ vipreṇa vavṛidhe* | "The wise Agni, illuminating

his own body at [the sound of] the sage and ancient hymn, has become augmented."

R. V. viii. 55, 11.—*Vayaṁ gha te apūrvyā Indra brahmāṇi vṛittrahan purutamāsaḥ puruhūta vajrivo bhṛitiṁ na pra bharāmasi* | "Indra, slayer of Vrittra, thunderer, invoked of many, we [thy] numerous [worshippers] bring to thee, as thy hire, hymns which never before existed."

R. V. viii. 63, 7, 8.—*Iyaṁ te navyasī matir Agne adhāyi asmad ā mandra sujāta sukrato amūra dasma atithe* | *sa te Agne śantamā chanishṭhā bhavatu priyā tayā vardhasva sushtutaḥ* | "O Agni, joyful, well-born, wise and wondrous guest, this new hymn has been offered to thee by us; may it be dear to thee, agreeable and pleasant: lauded by it, do thou increase."

R. V. viii. 65, 5, 6.— . . . *Indraṁ gīrbhir havāmahe* | *Indram pratnena manmanā marutvantam havāmahe ityādi* | 12. (= S. V. ii. 340.) *Vācham ashṭāpadīm aham navasraktim ṛitaspriśam* | *Indrāt pari tanvam mame* | 5. "We invoke Indra with songs; we invoke Indra, attended by the Maruts, with an ancient hymn. . . . 12. I twine round the body of Indra a verse of eight syllables and nine lines, abounding in sacred truth." (This verse is translated and explained by Professor Benfey, Sāmaveda, p. 255.)

R. V. ix. 9, 8.—*Nu navyase navīyase sūktāya sādhaya pathaḥ* | *pratnavad rochaya ruchaḥ* | "Prepare (o Soma) the paths for our newest, most recent, hymn; and, as of old, cause the lights to shine."

R. V. ix. 42, 2.—*Esha pratnena manmanā devo devebhyaḥ pari* | *dhāraya* [qu. *dhārayā*?] *pavate sutaḥ* | "This god, poured forth to the gods, with an ancient hymn, purifies with his stream."

R. V. ix. 91, 5.—*Sa pratnavad navyase viśvavāra sūktāya pathaḥ kṛiṇuhi prāchaḥ ityādi* | "O god, who possessest all good, make, as of old, forward paths for this new hymn."

R. V. ix. 99, 4 (= S. V. ii. 983).—*Taṁ gāthayā purāṇyā punānam abhi anūshata* | *uto kṛipanta dhītayo devānāṁ nāma*

bibhratīḥ | "They praised the pure god with an ancient song; and hymns embracing the names of the gods have supplicated him." (Benfey translates the last clause differently.)

R. V. x. 4, 6.— . . . *Iyaṁ te Agne navyasī manīshā ityādi* | "This is for thee, Agni, a new hymn," etc.

R. V. x. 89, 3.—*Samānam asmāy anapāvṛid archa ɔmayā divo asamam brahma navyam ityādi* | "Sing (to Indra) a new and unceasing hymn, worthy of him [?], and unequalled in earth or heaven [?]."

R. V. x. 91, 13.—*Imām pratnāya sushṭutiṁ navīyasīṁ vocheyam asmāy uśate śṛiṇotu naḥ* | "I will address to this ancient [deity] my new praises, which he desires; may he listen to us."

"R. V. x. 96, 11.— . . . *Navyaṁ navyaṁ haryasi manma nu priyam ityādi* | "Thou delightest in ever new hymns, which are dear to thee," etc.

SECT. III.—*Passages of the Rig-veda, in which the rishis describe themselves as the composers of the hymns.*

In this section, I propose to quote, first of all, those passages in which the rishis distinctly speak of themselves as the authors of the hymns, and express no consciousness whatever of deriving assistance or inspiration from any supernatural source. I shall then adduce some further texts in which, though nothing is directly stated regarding the composition of the hymns, there is at the same time nothing which would lead the reader to imagine that the rishis looked upon them as anything else than the offspring of their own minds.

I shall arrange the quotations in which the rishis distinctly claim the authorship, according to the particular *verb* which is employed to express this idea. These verbs are (1) *kṛi*, "to make," (2) *tax* (= the Greek τεκταίνομαι), "to fabricate," and (3) *jan*, "to beget, generate, or produce," with others which are less explicit.

I.—I proceed to adduce the passages in which (1) the verb

kṛi, "to make," is applied to the composition of the hymns. (Compare R. V. vii. 66, 6, already quoted in the last section.)

R. V. i. 20, 1.—*Ayaṁ devāya janmane stomo viprebhir āsayā | akāri ratna-dhātamaḥ.* | "This hymn, conferring wealth, has been *made* to the divine race, by the sages, with their mouth [or in presence of the gods]."

R. V. i. 31, 18.—*Etena Agne brahmaṇā vāvṛidhasva śaktī vā yat te chakṛima vidā vā* | "Grow, o Agni, by this prayer which we have *made* to thee through [or according to] our power, or our knowledge."

R. V. i. 61, 16.—*Evā te hariyojanā suvṛikti Indra brahmāṇi Gotamāsaḥ akran* | "Thus, o Indra, yoker of steeds, have the Gotamas made for thee pure [or beautiful] hymns."

R. V. i. 117, 25.—*Etāni vām Aśvinā vīryāṇi pra pūrvyāṇi āyavaḥ avochan | brahma kṛiṇvanto vṛishaṇā yuvabhyāṁ suvīrāso vidatham ā vadema* | "These, your ancient exploits, o Aśvins, our fathers have declared. Let us, who are strong in bold men, *making* a hymn for you, o bountiful gods, utter our offering of praise."

R. V. ii. 39, 8.—*Etāni vām Aśvinā vardhanāni brahma stomaṁ Gṛitsamadāsaḥ akran* | "These magnifying prayers, [this] hymn, o Aśvins, the Gritsamadas have *made* for you."

R. V. iii. 30, 20.—*Svaryavō matibhis tubhyaṁ viprā Indrāya vāhaḥ Kuśikāsaḥ akran* | "Seeking heaven, the sage Kuśikas have *made* a hymn with praises to thee, o Indra." (The word *vāhaḥ* is stated by Sāyana to be = *stotra*, "a hymn.")

R. V. iv. 6, 11.—*Akāri brahma samidhāna tubhyam ityādi* | "O kindled [Agni], a prayer has been *made* to thee."

R. V. iv. 16, 20.—*Eved Indrāya vṛishabhāya vrishṇe brahma akarma Bhṛiyavo na ratham* | . . . 21. *Akāri te harivo brahma navyaṁ dhiyā syāma rathyaḥ sadāsāḥ* | "Thus have we *made* a prayer for Indra, the productive, the vigorous, as the Bhṛigus [fashioned] a car. . . . 21. A *new* prayer has been *made* for thee, o lord of steeds. May we, through our hymn (or rite) become possessed of chariots and perpetual wealth."

R. V. vii. 35, 14.—*Ādityā Rudrā Vasavo jushanta* (the Atharva-veda has *jushantām*) *idam brahma kriyamāṇaṁ navīyaḥ | śṛiṇvantu no divyāḥ pārthivāso gojātā ityādi* | "May the Adityas, Rudras, and Vasus receive with pleasure this *new* prayer which is being *made*. May the gods of the air, the earth, and the sky hear us."

R. V. vii. 37, 4.—*Vayaṁ nu te dāśvāṁsaḥ syāma brahma kṛiṇvantaḥ ityādi* | "Let us offer oblations to thee, *making* prayers," etc.

R. V. vii. 97, 9.—*Iyaṁ vām Brahmaṇaspate suvṛiktir brahma Indrāya vajriṇe akāri* | "Brahmanaspati, this pure hymn, [this] prayer has been *made* for thee, and for Indra, the thunderer."

R. V. viii. 51, 4.—*Āyāhi kṛiṇavāma te Indra brahmāṇi vardhanā ityādi* | "Come, Indra: let us *make* prayers, which magnify thee," etc.

R. V. x. 54, 6.— . . . *Adha priyam bhūsham Indrāya manma brahmakṛito Vṛihadukthād avāchi* | ". . . An acceptable and honorific hymn has been uttered to Indra by Vṛihaduktha, *maker* of prayers."

R. V. x. 101, 2.—*Mandrā kṛiṇudhvaṁ dhiya ā tanudhvaṁ nāvam aritra-paraṇīṁ kṛiṇudhvam* | "*Make* hymns, prepare prayers, make a ship propelled by oars."

It is possible that in some of these passages the verb *kṛi* may have merely the signification which the word *make* has in English when we speak of "making supplications," etc., in which case it of course means to *offer up*, rather than to *compose*. But this cannot be the case in such passages as R. V. iv. 16, 20 (p. 129), where the rishi speaks of making the hymn as the Bhrigus made a chariot. And such an interpretation would be altogether inadmissible in the case of the texts which I next proceed to cite.

II.—Passages in which the word *tax*, "to fashion, or fabricate," is applied to the composition of the hymns.

R. V. i. 62, 13.—*Sanāyate Gotamaḥ Indra navyam ataxad*

brahma hariyojanāya ityādi | "Nodhas, descendant of Gotama, *fashioned* this new hymn for [thee], Indra, who art of old, and who yokest thy steeds," etc.

R. V. i. 130, 6.—*Imāṁ te vāchaṁ vasūyantaḥ Āyavo rathaṁ na dhīraḥ svapā ataxishuḥ sumnāya tvām ataxishuḥ* | "Desiring wealth, men have *fashioned* for thee this hymn, as a skilful workman [fabricates] a car, and thus they have disposed (*lit.* fashioned) thee to (confer) happiness."

R. V. i. 171, 2.—*Esha vaḥ stomo Maruto namasvān hṛidā tashṭo manasā dhāyi devāḥ* | "This reverential hymn, o divine Maruts, *fashioned* by the heart, has been presented by the mind [or, according to Sāyana, 'let it be received by you with a favourable mind']."

R. V. ii. 19, 8.—*Evā te Gṛitsamadāḥ śūra manma avasyavo na vayunāni taxuḥ* | "Thus, o hero, have the Gritsamadas, desiring succour, *fashioned* for thee a hymn, as men make roads." (Sāyana explains *vayuna* by "road;" but it generally means knowledge.)

R. V. ii. 35, 2.—*Imaṁ su asmai hridaḥ ā sutashṭam mantraṁ vochema kuvid asya vedat* | "Let us address to him from the heart this *well-fashioned* hymn; may he be aware of it."

R. V. v. 2, 11.—*Etaṁ te stomaṁ tuvi-jāta vipro rathaṁ na dhīraḥ svapā ataxam* | "I, a sage, have *fabricated* this hymn for thee, o powerful [deity], as a skilful workman fashions a car."

R. V. v. 29, 15.—*Indra brahma kriyamāṇā jushasva yā te śavishṭha navyā akarma* | *vastreva bhadrā sukṛitā vasūyuḥ rathaṁ na dhīraḥ svapā ataxam* | "O mighty Indra, regard with favour the prayers which are *made*, the new [prayers] which we have *made* for thee. Desirous of wealth, I have *fabricated* them like beautiful well-fashioned garments, as a skilful workman [constructs] a car." (Compare R. V. iii. 39, 2; above, p. 123).

R. V. v. 73, 10.—*Imā brahmāṇi vardhanā Aśvibhyāṁ santu śantamā* | *yā taxāma rathān iva avochāma bṛihad namaḥ* |

"May these magnifying prayers which we have *fashioned*, like cars, be pleasing to the Aśvins: we have uttered great adoration."

R. V. vi. 32, 1 (= S. V. i. 322).—*Apūrvyā purutamāni asmai mahe vīrāya tavase turāya | virapśine vajriṇe śantamāni vachāṁsi āsā sthavirāya taxam* | "To this great hero, vigorous, energetic, the adorable, unshaken thunderer, I have with my mouth *fabricated* copious and pleasing prayers, which had never before existed."

R. V. vi. 16, 47.—*Ā te Agne ṛichā havir hridā tashṭam bharāmasi* | "In this verse, Agni, we bring to thee an oblation *fabricated* by the heart." (Comp. R. V. iii. 39, 1, in p. 123.)

R. V. vii. 7, 6.—*Ete dyumnebhir viśvam ātiranta mantraṁ ye vā araṁ naryā ataxan* | "These men who have skilfully *fabricated* the hymn, have by their praises [?] augmented all [their possessions?]."

R. V. vii. 64, 4.—*Yo vāṁ garttam manasā taxad etam ūrddhvāṁ dhītiṁ kṛiṇavad dhārayachcha* | "May he who with his mind *fashioned* for you (Mitra and Varuna) this car, make and sustain the lofty hymn." (The same expression *ūrddhvā dhītiḥ* occurs in R. V. i. 119, 2.)

R. V. viii. 6, 33.—*Uta brahmaṇyā vayaṁ tubhyam pravriddha vajrivo viprā ataxma jīvase* | "O mighty thunderer, we, who are sage, have *fabricated* prayers [or ceremonies] for thee, that we may live." (I take *brahmaṇyā* for the neuter plural, as it has no *visarga* in my copy of the R. V.)

R. V. x. 39, 14.—*Etaṁ vāṁ stomam Aśvināv akarma ataxāma Bhṛigavo na ratham | ni amṛixāma yoshaṇāṁ na maryye nityaṁ na sūnuṁ tanayaṁ dadhānāḥ* | "This hymn, Asvins, we have *made* for you; we have *fabricated* it as the Bhrigus [constructed] a car [or we have, like the Bhrigus, *fabricated* a car]; we have decorated it, as a bride for her husband, continuing the series [of our praises] like an unbroken line of descendants."

(The following is Sāyana's comment on this passage, for a copy of which I am indebted to Professor Müller: *He Aśvinau*

vāṁ yuvayor etaṁ yathoktaṁ stomaṁ stotram akarma akurma | Tad etad āha | Bhṛigavo na Bhṛigava ina ratham ataxāma vayaṁ stotram saṁskṛitavantaḥ | karma-yogād Ṛibhavo Bhṛigavaḥ uchyante | athavā rathakārā Bhṛigavaḥ | kiñcha vayaṁ nityaṁ śāśvataṁ tanayaṁ yāgādīnāṁ karmaṇāṁ tanitāraṁ sūnuṁ na aurasam putram iva stotraṁ dadhānā dhārayanto martye manushye nyamṛixāma yuvayoḥ stutiṁ nitarāṁ saṁskṛiavantaḥ | "Aśvins, we have made this preceding hymn or praise of you. He explains this. Like the Bhrigus, we have made a car, we have carefully constructed a hymn. The Ribhus are, from this work being ascribed to them [?], styled Bhrigus; or *bhrigus* are chariot-makers. Moreover, maintaining this praise as a constant perpetuator (like a legitimate son) of sacrifice and other rites, we have polished, *i.e.*, carefully composed a celebration of you among men [?]". (In this comment the word *yoshaṇā* is left unexplained. In verse 12 of this hymn the Aśvins are supplicated *to come in a car fleeter than thought, constructed for them by the Ṛibhus:—ā tena yātam manaso javīyasā ratham yaṁ vām Ṛibhavaś chakrur Aśvinā* |)

R. V. x. 80, 7.—*Agnaye brahma Ṛibhavas tataxuḥ* | "The Ribhus [or the wise] *fabricated* a hymn for Agni."

III.—I next quote some texts in which the hymns are spoken of as being *generated* by the rishis. (Comp. R. V. vii. 93, 1, in p. 125.)

R. V. iii. 2. 1.—*Vaiśvānarāya dhishaṇām ṛitāvṛidhe ghṛitaṁ na pūtam Agnaye janāmasi* | "We *generate* a hymn, like pure butter, for Agni Vaiśvānara, who promotes our sacred rites."

R. V. vii. 15, 4.—*Navaṁ nu stomam Agnaye divaḥ śyenāya jījanam | vasvaḥ kuvid vanāti naḥ* | "I have *generated* a new hymn to Agni, the falcon of the sky; who bestows on us wealth in abundance."

R. V. vii. 22, 9.—*Ye cha pūrve ṛishayo ye cha nūtnāḥ Indra brahmāṇi janayanta vipraḥ* | "Indra, the wise rishis, both ancient and modern, have *generated* prayers."

R. V. vii. 26, 1.—*Na somaḥ Indram asuto mamāda na abrahmāṇo maghavānaṁ sutāsaḥ | tasmāy ukthaṁ janaye yaj*

jujoshad nṛivad navīyaḥ śṛiṇavad yathā naḥ | "The soma cheers not Indra unless it be poured out; nor do libations [gratify] Maghavan when offered without a priest. To him I *generate* a hymn such as may please him, that, after the manner of men, he may hear our *new* [song]."

R. V. vii. 31, 11.— . . . *Suvṛiktim Indrāya brahma janayanta viprāḥ* | "The sages *generated* a pure hymn and a prayer for Indra."

R. V. vii. 94, 1, 2 (= S. V. ii. 266).—*Iyāṁ vām asya manmanaḥ Indrāgnī pūrvya-stutir abhrād vṛishṭir iva ajani* | *śṛiṇutaṁ jaritur havam ityādi* | "The excellent praise of this hymn [or the excellent hymn of this sage] has been *generated* [or, has sprung] for you, Indra and Agni, like rain from a cloud. Hear the invocation of your worshipper," etc. (Benfey thinks *manman*, "spirit," is to be understood of Soma, whose hymn, *i.e.*, the sound of his dropping, resembles the falling of rain. The scholiast of the S. V. makes *manman* = stoṭri, "worshipper").

R. V. viii. 43, 2.—*Asmai te pratiharyate Jātavedo vicharshaṇe Agne janāmi sushṭutim* | "Wise Agni Jātavedas, I *generate* a hymn for thee, who receivest it with favour."

R. V. viii. 77, 4.—*Ā tvā ayam arka ūtaye vavarttati yaṁ Gotamā ajījanan* | "This hymn which the Gotamas have *generated*, incites thee to succour us."

R. V. viii. 84, 4, 5.—*Śrudhi havaṁ Tiraśchyāḥ Indra yas tvā saparyati suvīryasya gomato rāyaḥ pūrdhi mahān asi* | *Indra yas te navīyasīṁ giram mandrām ajījanat chikitvin-manasaṁ dhiyam pratnām ṛitasya pipyushīm* | "Hear, Indra, the invocation of Tiraśchī, thy worshipper; replenish him with wealth in strong men and in cattle, for thou art great. Indra [do this for him] who has *generated* for thee a *new* and exhilarating hymn, springing from an intelligent mind, an *ancient* mental product, full of sacred truth."

(These verses occur also in the Sāma-veda ii. 233, 234, and are translated by Professor Benfey, at pp. 230, and 250, of his edition. The hymn referred to in this passage is apparently

designated as both new and old. How can it be both? It may have been an old hymn re-written and embellished; ancient in substance, though new in expression. Compare St. John's Gospel, xiii. 34, and the First Epistle of St. John, ii. 7, 8, and iii. 11.)

R. V. ix. 73, 2.— . . . *madhor dhārābhir janayanto arkam it priyām Indrasya tanvam avīvṛidhan* | "Together with the honied streams, *generating* the hymn, they have augmented the beloved body of Indra."

R. V. ix. 95, 1 (= S. V. i. 530).— . . . *ato matīr janayata svadhābhiḥ* | "Wherefore *generate* hymns with the oblations." (Professor Benfey makes *janayata* the 3rd person singular of the imperfect middle, and applies it to Soma).

R. V. x. 7, 2.—*Imā Agne matayas tubhyaṁ jātāḥ gobhir aśvair abhi gṛiṇanti rādhaḥ* | "These hymns, Agni, *generated* for thee, supplicate [?] wealth with [or celebrate thy wealth in] cows and horses."

R. V. x. 23, 5, 6, 7.—*Yo vāchā vivācho mṛidhravāchaḥ purū sahasrā aśivā jaghāna* | *Tat tad id asya pauṁsyaṁ gṛiṇīmasi pitā iva yas tavishīṁ vāvridhe śavaḥ* | *stomaṁ te Indra Vimadā ajījanann apūrvyam purutamaṁ sudānave* | *Vidmā hi asya bhojanam inasya yad ā paśuṁ na gopāḥ karāmahe* | *mā kir naḥ enā sakhyā viyaushus tava cha Indra Vimadasya cha ṛisheḥ* | *Vidmā hi te pramatiṁ deva jāmi-vad asme te santu sakhyā śivāni* | "Who (Indra) with his voice slew many thousand of the wicked uttering confused and hostile cries. We laud his several acts of valour, who, like a father, augmented [?] our vigour and our strength. For thee, o Indra, who art bountiful, the Vimadas have *generated* a copious hymn, which never before existed (*apūrvya*); for we know what is gratifying to this our master; and we collect it together, as a cowherd assembles his cattle. Indra, may that friendship of ours never be dissolved, which exists between thee and the rishi Vimada: for we know thy wisdom, o god; may thy friendship be favourable to us, like that of a kinsman."

R. V. x. 67, 1.—*Imāṁ dhiyaṁ saptaśīrshṇīm pitā naḥ ṛita-prajātām bṛihatīm avindat | turīyaṁ svij janayad viśvajanyo Ayāsya uktham Indrāya śansan* | "Our father hath discovered [or invented] this great, seven-headed hymn, born of sacred truth; Ayāsya, friend of all men, celebrating Indra, has *generated* the fourth song of praise." (In his Lexicon, Roth gives Ayāsya as a proper name; but says it may also be an adjective with the sense of "unwearied.")

R. V. x. 91, 14.—*Kīlāla-pe soma-pṛishṭāya vedhase hṛidā matiṁ janaye chārum Agnaye* | "With my heart I *generate* a beautiful hymn for Agni, the drinker of nectar, the soma-sprinkled, the wise." (See also R. V. i. 109, 1, 2, which will be quoted below.)

IV.—In the following texts the verbal root *ṛi*, "to move, send forth," etc., used with or without a preposition, is applied to the utterance or (it may even mean) the production of hymns.

R. V. i. 116, 1.—*Nāsatyābhyām barhir iva pravṛiñje stomān iyarmi abhriyā iva vātaḥ | yāv arbhagāya Vimadāya jāyām senā-juvā ni ūhatuḥ rathena* | "In like manner as I spread the sacrificial grass to the Nāsatyas (Aśvins), so do I *send forth* to them hymns, as the wind [drives] the clouds; to them (I say), who bore off to the youthful Vimada his bride in a chariot which outstripped the enemy's host."

R. V. vii. 61, 2.—*Pra vāṁ sa Mitrā-Varuṇau ṛitāvā vipro manmāni dīrgha-śrud iyartti | Yasya brahmāṇi sukratū avāthaḥ ā yat kratvā na śaradaḥ pṛiṇaithe* [?] | "The devout sage, deeply versed in sacred lore, *sends forth* his hymns to you, o Mitra and Varuna. You, mighty gods, receive his prayers with favour, since ye fill [prolong?], as it seems, his autumns by your power."

R. V. viii. 12, 31.—*Imāṁ te Indra sushṭutiṁ viprāḥ iyartti dhītibhiḥ | jāmim padā iva pipratīm pra adhvare* | "The sage, with praises, *sends forth* to thee this hymn, which like a sister follows [?] thy steps in the sacrifice."

R. V. viii. 13, 26.— . . . *Ritād iyarmi te dhiyam manoyujam* |

". . . From the sacred ceremony I *send forth* a prayer, issuing from my mind [or, which will reach thy heart ?]"

R. V. x. 116, 9.—*Pra Indrāgnibhyāṁ suvachasyām iyarmi sindhāv iva prerayaṁ nāvam arkaiḥ* | "I *send forth* a [hymn] with beautiful words to Indra and Agni; with my praises I have, as it were, launched a ship on the sea."

(Compare R. V. ii. 42, 1, spoken of Indra in the form of the bird called kapinjala, a sort of partridge: *Iyartti vācham ariteva nāvam* | "It sends forth a voice, as a rower propels a boat." See also R. V. x. 101, 2, quoted above, p. 130.)

V.—In the following passages, other verbs are employed to denote the composition or presentation of hymns.

R. V. i. 61, 2.—*Indrāya hṛidā manasā manīshā pratnāya patye dhiyo marjayanta* | "To Indra, the ancient lord, they *prepared* [or polished] hymns [or ceremonies] with the heart, mind, and understanding."

R. V. i. 61, 4.—*Asmai id u stomaṁ saṁhinomi rathaṁ na tashṭā iva tat-sināya ityādi* | "To him (Indra) I *send forth* a hymn, as a carpenter a car, for his food," etc.

R. V. i. 94, 1 (= S. V. i. 66).—*Imaṁ stomam arhate Jātavedase ratham iva sam mahemā manīshayā* | *bhadrā hi naḥ pramatir asya saṁsadi Agne sakhye mā rishāmā vayaṁ tava* | "Let us with our intellects *decorate* this hymn for the adorable Jātavedas like a car, for his wisdom is favourable to us in the assembly. Agni, in thy friendship may we never suffer." (The root *mah* means to honour or worship. I have partly followed Benfey's translation.)

There is to be found in the hymns a great multitude of passages in which the rishi speaks of presenting his hymns and prayers to the various deities who are the objects of his worship, without directly claiming for himself the authorship of those compositions. The natural inference to be drawn from the expressions which we shall find to be employed in most of the cases to which I refer, would, I think, be that the personality of the rishi himself was uppermost in his mind, and that he was

not conscious that the praises which he was uttering to the gods proceeded from any other source than his own unaided faculties. Of this description are the following texts, which represent a manner of thinking and speaking very prevalent in the hymns.

R. V. i. 60, 5.—*Tam tvā vayam patim Agne rayīṇām praśamsāmo matibhir Gotamāsaḥ* | "We, the Gotamas, praise with hymns thee, Agni, the lord of riches."

R. V. i. 77, 5.—*Eva Agnir Gotamebhir ṛitāvā viprebhir astoshṭa jātavedaḥ* | "Thus has the holy Agni Jātavedas been celebrated by the sage Gotamas."

R. V. i. 78, 5.—*Avochāma Rahūgaṇā Agnaye madhumad vachaḥ* | *dyumnair abhi pra ṇonumaḥ* | "We, the Rahūganas, have uttered to Agni a honied speech; we laud him with eulogies."

R. V. i. 91, 11.—*Soma gīrbhis tvā vayaṁ vardhayāmo vachovidaḥ* | *sumṛiḷīko na āviśa* | "Soma, we who are skilled in speech magnify thee with praises; do thou enter into us, bringing joy."

R. V i. 102, 1.—*Imāṁ te dhiyam prabhare maho mahīm asya stotre dhishaṇā yat te ānaje* | "I present to thee, the great (god) this great hymn, because thy understanding has taken pleasure in my praises."

(Sāyana renders *prabhare* by *prakarsheṇa sampādayāmi* | "I carefully make or accomplish." Roth renders *ānaje* "has been honoured." See his Lexicon, under the word *añj*.)

R. V. i. 183, 6.—*Atārishma tamasas pāram asya prati vāṁ stomo Aśvināv adhāyi* | "We have crossed over this darkness; a hymn, o Aśvins, has been addressed to you."

R. V. iv. 3, 16.—*Etā viśvā vidushe tubhyaṁ vedho nīthāni Agne niṇyā vachāṁsi* | *nivachanā kavaye kāvyāni aśaṁsisham matibhir vipraḥ ukthaiḥ* | "Prudent Agni, to thee, who art wise, [have I uttered] all these songs and mysterious words; to thee, who art a bard, have I, a sage, uttered these hymns, these poems, with meditations and praises."

R. V. iv. 32, 12.—*Avīvṛidhanta Gotamā Indra tve stomavā-*

hasaḥ | "The Gotamas, Indra, bringing hymns to thee, have magnified thee."

R. V. v. 11, 5.—*Tubhya idam Agne madhumattamaṁ vachas tubham manīshā iyam astu śaṁ hṛide* | *Tvāṁ giraḥ sindhum iva avanīr mahīr ā pṛiṇanti śavasā vardhayanti cha* | "Agni, may this sweetest of prayers, may this hymn (mental production) be pleasant to thy heart. As great rivers fill the ocean, so do the words of praise fill thee, and augment thee with strength."

R. V. v. 22, 4.—*Agne chikiddhi asya naḥ idaṁ vachaḥ sahasya* | *Taṁ tvā suśipra dampate stomair vardhanti Atrayo gīrbhiḥ śumbhanti Atrayaḥ* | "Vigorous Agni, know these our words; thee, with the beautiful nose, the lord of the house, the Atris magnify with praises, the Atris decorate with hymns."

R. V. v. 45, 4.—*Sūktebhir vo vachobhir devajushtair Indrā nu Agnī avase huvadhyai* | *ukthebhir hi sma kavayaḥ suyajñā āvivāsanto Maruto yajanti* | "Let me invoke you for help, o Indra and Agni, with well-spoken words, such as are acceptable to the gods; for sages skilled in sacrifice, when performing sacred rites, quick as the Maruts [?], worship with hymns."

R. V. vi. 38, 3.—*Taṁ vo dhiyā paramayā purājām ajaram Indram abhi anūshi arkaiḥ ityādi* | "I adore thee, the ancient, imperishable Indra with an excellent hymn and with praises."

R. V. vii. 67, 5.—*Prāchīm ū devā Aśvinā dhiyam me amṛidhrāṁ sātaye kṛitaṁ vasūyum* | "O divine Aśvins, make my early and unwearied prayer which supplicates wealth, to be productive of blessings."

R. V. vii. 85, 1.—*Punīshe vām araxasam manīshām somam Indrāya Varuṇāya juhvat* | *ghṛita-pratīkām Ushasaṁ na devīm ityādi* | "Offering soma to Indra and Varuna, I purify for you twain the sincere hymn, like the goddess Ushas, with glittering face."

R. V. viii. 5, 18.—*Asmākam adya vām ayaṁ stomo vāhishṭho antamaḥ* | *yuvābhyaṁ bhūtu Aśvinā* | "May this hymn of ours approach near to you, to-day, o Aśvins, and be effectual in bearing you hither."

R. V. viii. 8, 8.—*Kim anye paryāsate asmat stomebhir Aśvinā | putraḥ Kaṇvasya vām ṛishir gīrbhir Vatso avīvṛidhat |* "Aśvins, do others than we [?] sit round you with songs? Vatsa, the son of Kanva, has magnified you by his hymns."

R. V. viii. 27, 11.—*Idā hi va upastutim idā vāmasya bhaktaye upa vo viśvavedaso namasyur āsṛixi |* "For now, possessors of all riches, now, in order to obtain wealth, have I, full of devotion, sent forth to you a hymn."

R. V. x. 42. 1.—*Astā iva suprataraṁ lāyam asyan bhūshann iva prabhara stomam asmai | vāchā viprās tarata vācham aryo niramaya jaritaḥ some Indram |* "Like an archer discharging his far-shooting arrow, or as it were making decorations, present the hymn to Indra. Sages, by your song, overcome the song of the enemy; worshipper, arrest Indra at the soma."

R. V. x. 63, 17.—*Eva Plateḥ sūnur avīvṛidhad vo viśve Ādityā Adite manīshī | īśānāso naro amartyena astāvi jano divyo Gayena |* "Thus, all ye Adityas, Aditi, and ye ruling powers, has the wise son of Plati magnified you. The celestial race has been lauded by the immortal Gaya." (I am unable to say in what sense the rishi here speaks of himself as *immortal.*)

R. V. x. 111, 1.—*Manīshiṇaḥ prabharadhvam manīshām yathā yathā matayaḥ santi nṛiṇam | Indraṁ satyair ā īrayāma kṛitebhiḥ sa hi vīro girvaṇasyur vidānaḥ |* "Sages, present the prayer, according as are the thoughts of men. Let us by our sincere rites stimulate [?] Indra, for he is a hero, he is wise, and loves our songs."

In the following verse, from a hymn in praise of liberality, it is said, though no doubt only figuratively, that the *true rishi* is the prince who is bountiful to the priesthood.

R. V. x. 107, 6.—*Tam eva ṛishiṁ tam ū brahmāṇam āhur yajñanyaṁ sāmagam ukthaśasam | sa śukrasya tanvo veda tisro yaḥ prathamo daxiṇayā rarādha |* "He it is whom they call a rishi, a priest, a pious sacrificer, a chaunter of prayers, a singer of hymns; he it is who knows the three bodies of brilliant (Agni),—the man who is most prominent in bestowing gifts."

SECT. IV.—*Passages of the Rig-veda in which a supernatural character is ascribed to the rishis or the hymns.*

In the present section I propose to collect the most distinct indications which I have noticed in the vedic hymns of any supernatural attributes attaching, in the opinion of the authors, either to the rishis themselves, or to their compositions. We shall see in the course of this enquiry (I.), that a certain superhuman character was ascribed by the later rishis, who composed the hymns, to some of their predecessors; (II.) that expressions are occasionally employed by the rishis which appear to ascribe their compositions to a divine influence *generally;* while there is a still more numerous set of texts in which the hymns are attributed in various forms of phraseology to the agency of one or more *particular* and specified deities; and (III.) that there is a considerable number of passages in which a mysterious or magical power is ascribed to the hymns or metres.

I proceed to furnish specimens of these several classes of quotations.

I.—I adduce some passages which ascribe a superhuman character or supernatural faculties to the earlier rishis. These are the following:—

R. V. i. 179, 2.—*Ye chid hi pūrve ṛitasāpaḥ āsan sākaṁ devebhir avadann ṛitāni | te chid avāsur ityādi |* "The pious sages who lived of old, and who conversed about sacred truths with the gods, led a conjugal life," etc.

The sixty-second hymn of the tenth Mandala contains the following passage regarding the Angirases (see above, p. 120):—

1. *The Angirases.*—R. V. x. 62, 1, 3.—*Ye yajñena daxiṇayā samaktāḥ Indrasya sakhyam amṛitatvam ānaśa | tebhyo bhadram Aṇgiraso vaḥ astu prati gribhṇīta mānavaṁ sumedhasaḥ |* 3. *Ye ṛitena sūryam arohayan divi aprathayan pṛithivīm mātaram vi ityādi |* "Blessings be on the Angirases who, sanctified by sacrifice and liberality, attained the friendship of Indra and immortality. Do ye, o sage Angirases, graciously receive the

race of Manu. 3. They who by sacrifice caused the sun to ascend the sky; and spread out our mother earth," etc. (My copy of the R. V. reads in the first line *ānaśa*. Perhaps it should be *ānasuḥ*, as in R. V. i. 164, 23.)

This is succeeded by the following verses :—

R. V. x. 62, 4, 5.—*Ayaṁ nābhā vadati valguvo gṛihe devaputrāḥ ṛishayas tat śṛiṇotana . . . | virūpāsaḥ id ṛishayas te id gambhīra-vepasaḥ | Aṅgirasaḥ sūnavas te Agneḥ parijajñire |* "This sage addresses you, brilliant beings, within [?] the house. Hear this, ye rishis, sons of the gods. The rishis are various in character, profound in emotion; they are the sons of Angiras; they have been born from Agni."

(The last verse is quoted in the Nirukta, xi. 17. See Roth's illustrations of the passage.)

2. *Vasishṭha.*—A supernatural character is attributed to Vasishtha also in the following passage (portions of which have been already quoted and illustrated in Part First, pp. 75 ff. and 122.)

R. V. vii. 33, 7 ff.—*Trayaḥ kṛiṇvanti bhuvanasya retas tisraḥ prajāḥ āryāḥ jyotir-agrāḥ | trayo gharmāsaḥ ushasaṁ sachante sarvān it tān anuvidur Vasishṭhāḥ |* 8. *Sūryasyeva vaxatho jyotir eshāṁ samudrasyeva mahimā gabhīraḥ | vātasyeva prajavo na anyena stomo Vasishṭhā anu etave vaḥ |* 9. *Te id niṇyam hṛidayasya praketaiḥ sahasra-valśam abhi sañcharanti | yamena tatam paridhiṁ vayantaḥ apsarasaḥ upa sedur Vasishṭhāḥ |* 10. *Vidyuto jyotiḥ parisaṁjihānam Mitrā-Varuṇā yad apaśyatāṁ tvā | tat te janma uta ekaṁ Vasishṭha Agastyo yat tvā viśaḥ ājabhāra |* 11. *Utāsi Maitrāvaruṇo Vasishṭha Urvaśyāḥ brahman manaso 'dhi jātaḥ | drapsaṁ skannam brahmaṇā daivyena viśve devāḥ pushkare tvā adadanta |* 12. *Saḥ praketaḥ ubhayasya pravidvān sahasra-dānaḥ uta vā sadānaḥ | yamena tatam paridhiṁ vayishyan apsarasaḥ parijajñe Vasishṭhaḥ |* 13. *Satre ha jātāv ishitā namobhiḥ kumbhe retaḥ sisichituḥ samānam | tato ha Mānaḥ udiyāya madhyāt tato jātam ṛishim āhur Vasishṭham |* 14. *Uktha-bhṛitaṁ sāma-bhṛitam bibhartti grāvāṇam bibhrad*

pra vadāti agre | upa enam ādhvaṁ sumanasyamānāḥ ā vo gachhāti pratṛido Vasishṭhaḥ | "Three [gods] create the fecundating principle of the world; [there exist] three excellent productions of which light is the first: three fires attend upon the dawn: all these the Vasishthas know. The splendour of these [sages] is like the glory of the sun; their grandeur is profound as that of the ocean; their impetuosity is like that of the wind; your hymns, o Vasishthas, cannot be rivalled by any other bard. Through the longings of their hearts they seek after the mysterious [tree?] with a thousand branches; weaving the veil extended by Yama [Agni? see R. V. i. 66, 4.] the Vasishthas sat near the Apsaras. When Mitra and Varuna saw thee embracing the gleam of the lightning, that was thy birth, Vasishtha, and [thou hadst] one [other], when Agastya brought thee from the house. And, Vasishtha, thou art the son of Mitra and Varuna, born, o priest, from the mind of Urvaśī; all the gods received thee—the drop fallen through divine energy,—in the vessel. He the wise, knowing both [worlds?], lavishing a thousand gifts or all gifts, Vasishtha, seeking to weave the veil extended by Yama, was produced from the Apsaras. Born at the sacrifice, and impelled by adorations, they [Mitra and Varuna] let the same procreative energy fall into the jar; from the midst of this Māna (Agastya) issued forth; from this men say the rishi Vasishtha was produced. He directs [?] the singer of the *uktha* and the chaunter of the *sāman*; handling the soma stones, he leads the hymn; wait on him with reverence and good-will; Vasishtha comes to you."

(Two of these verses are quoted in the Nirukta, verse 8, in xi. 20, and verse 11, in v. 13, 14. See also Prof. Roth's illustrations, p. 64, where he states his opinion that the foregoing verses which describe the miraculous birth of Vasishtha in the style of the epic mythology, are a later addition to an older hymn. I am unable to state the meaning of the word *pratṛidaḥ*.)

The two following passages also have reference to knowledge

supernaturally communicated, or favours divinely conferred on Vasishtha. See Part First, p. 77.

R. V. vii. 87, 4.—*Uvācha me Varuṇo medhirāya triḥ sapta nāma aghnyā bibhartti | vidvān padasya guhyā na vochad yugāya viprāḥ uparāya śixan |* "Varuna said to me, the sage, 'the cow has thrice seven names.' The wise and intelligent [god] instructing us, has declared the secrets of the celestial region [?] to this later generation."

R. V. vii. 88, 4.—*Vasishṭhaṁ ha Varuṇo nāvi ādhād ṛishiṁ chakāra svapā mahobhiḥ | stotāram viprāḥ sudinatve ahnāṁ yād nu dyāvas tatanan yād ushasaḥ |* "Varuna has placed Vasishtha in the ship; the beneficent [deity] has, by his mighty deeds, made him a rishi, [and caused] his worshipper to enjoy a fortunate existence, so that his days and dawns have been prolonged." (See Part First, p. 77, note 32; and R. V. x. 101, 2, and x. 116, 9, in pp. 130 and 137, above.)

3. *Viśvāmitra.*—In one or more of the texts which I shall next produce, a superhuman character is ascribed to Viśvamitra and the Kuśikas.

R. V. iii. 29, 15.—*Amitrāyudho marutām iva prayāḥ prathamajāḥ brahmaṇo viśvam id viduḥ | dyumnavad brahma Kuśikāsa erire ekaḥ eko dame Agniṁ samīdhire |* "Combating their foes, like hosts of Maruts, the first-born of Brahma [or prayer?] are masters of all knowledge; the Kuśikas have uttered a prayer accompanied with oblations; every one of them has kindled Agni in his house." (See Part First, p. 125, note.)

R. V. iii. 43, 5.—*Kuvid mā gopāṁ karase janasya kuvid rājānam Maghavann ṛijīshan | kuvid mā ṛishim papivāṁsaṁ sutasya kuvid me vasvaḥ amṛitasya śixāḥ |* "Thou assuredly makest me a shepherd of men; thou assuredly makest me a king, o impetuous Maghavan; thou assuredly makest me a rishi, a drinker of the soma; thou wilt assuredly bestow upon me imperishable wealth." (See First Part, p. 85.)

R. V. iii. 53, 9.—*Māhan ṛishir devajāḥ devajūtaḥ astabhnāt sindhum arṇavaṁ nṛichaxāḥ | Viśvāmitro yad avahat Sudāsam*

apriyāyata Kuśikebhir Indraḥ | "The great rishi (Visvāmitra), director of men, sprung from the gods, and god-impelled, stemmed the watery current. When Viśvāmitra guided Sudās, Indra was propitiated through the Kuśikas." (See Part First, pp. 124, 125. Indra himself is called a Kauśika in R. V. i. 10, 11. See Part First, p. 82.)

According to R. V. ix. 87, 3, certain mysterious knowledge is said to have been possessed by Uśanas: *Ṛishir viprah pura-etā janānām ṛibhur dhīra Uśanā kāvyena* | *sa chid viveda nihitañ yad āsām apīchyañ guhyañ nāma gonām* | "A wise rishi, a leader of men, skilful, and prudent, is Uśanas, through his insight as a seer; he has known the hidden mysterious name applied to these cows."

In some hymns of the tenth Mandala, the rishis are spoken of as "seeing" different objects of contemplation; thus in R. V. x. 72, 1, 2, it is said: *Devānāñ nu vayañ jānā pravochāma vipanyayā* | *uktheshu śasyamāneshu yaḥ paśyād uttare yuge* | *Brahmaṇaspatir etā sañ karmāra iva adhamat devānām pūrvye yuge asataḥ sad ajāyata* | "Let us, from the love of praise, celebrate in chaunted songs the births of the gods—any of us who in this later generation may behold them. Brahmanaspati has kindled these births, as a blacksmith [blows a flame]: in the earliest age of the gods, the existent sprang from the non-existent."

(The first of these verses is translated by Prof. Benfey in his Glossary to the Sāma-veda, p. 154.)

And in R. V. x. 79, 1, the rishi says: *Apaśyam asya mahato mahitvam amartyasya martyāsu vixu* | "I beheld the greatness of this great immortal among the race of mortals." (Here, however, as Agni is the subject, the poet might easily enough *see* him, while his imagination would supply the figurative attributes which he goes on to describe.)

A still more decided instance, however, of this use of the verb *to see*, in the sense of supernatural insight, may be found in the verse of the Vālakhilya already quoted in Part Second, pp. 220, which will be repeated below.

The next two passages speak of the *radiance* of the rishis.

R. V. viii. 3, 3 (= S. V. i. 250 and Vāj. S. 33, 81).—*Imā u tvā purūvaso giro vardhantu yā mama | pāvaka-varṇāḥ śuchayo vipaśchitaḥ abhi stomair anūshata |* "Lord of abundant wealth, may these prayers of mine magnify thee! Pure sages of fiery radiance have celebrated thee with hymns."

R. V. viii. 6, 10.—*Aham id hi pituḥ pari medhām ṛitasya jagrabha | aham sūrya iva ajani |* "I have acquired the wisdom of [my] righteous father; I have become like the sun."

The following texts, which occur in the last book of the Rig-veda, speak of *tapas* ("devotion" or "austerity") being practised by the rishis much in the same way as the later epic literature does. This use of the word is not known in the earlier books of the R. V. (See Boehtlingk and Roth's Lexicon, under the word *tapas*.)

R. V. x. 109, 4.—*Devā etasyām avadanta pūrve sapta ṛishayas tapase ye nisheduḥ |* "The ancient gods spoke of her, the seven rishis who sat down for devotion."

R. V. x. 154, 2.—*Tapasā ye anādhṛiśyās tapasā ye svar yayuḥ | tapo ye chakṛire mahas tāṁs chid eva api gachchatāt |* 5. *Sahasra-nīthāḥ kavayo ye gopāyanti sūryam ṛishīṁs tapasvato Yama tapojān api gachhatāt |* "Come to those who through devotion are invincible, who by devotion have gone to heaven, who have performed great austerity. 5. Come, Yama, to the sages of a thousand songs who guard the sun (see Wilson, Vish. Pur. pp. 234, 235), to the devout rishis, whose nature is devotion."

R. V. x. 190, 1.—*Ṛitañcha satyañcha abhīddhāt tapaso adhy ajāyata | tato rātrī ajāyata tataḥ samudraḥ arṇavaḥ |* "Right and truth sprang from kindled devotion; thence sprang night, thence the watery ocean."

In R. V. x. 167, 1, it is even said that Indra attained heaven by austerity: *Tvaṁ tapaḥ paritapya ajayaḥ svaḥ |* "By performing austerity thou didst conquer heaven."

In some places the gods are said to possess in the most emi-

nent degree the qualities of *rishis*, or *kavis*. This may imply, *e converso*, that the rishis were conscious of a certain affinity with the divine nature, and conceived themselves to participate in some degree in the superior wisdom and knowledge of the deities.

R. V. i. 31, 1.—*Tvam Agne prathamo Aṅgirā ṛishir devo devānām abhavaḥ śivaḥ sakhā ityādi* | 2. *Tvam Agne prathamo Aṅgirastamaḥ kavir devānām paribhūshasi vratam* | "Thou, Agni, the earliest *rishi* Angiras, a god, wast the auspicious friend of the gods. . . . Thou, Agni, the earliest and most Angiras-like sage, decoratest the ceremonial of the gods."

R. V. i. 66, 2.— . . . *Ṛishir na stubhvā vixu praśastaḥ ityādi* | "Like a *rishi*, who praises [the gods], he (Agni) is famous among the people," etc.

R. V. iii. 21, 3.— . . . *Ṛishiḥ śreshthaḥ samidhyase yajñasya pra avitā bhava* | "Thou, Agni, the most eminent *rishi*, art kindled; be the protector of the sacrifice."

R. V. v. 29, 1.— . . . *Archanti tvā marutaḥ pūta-daxās tvam eshām ṛishir Indra asi dhīraḥ* | "The Maruts, endowed with pure force, worship thee; thou, Indra, art their *rishi*." (Sāyana, however, here renders *ṛishi* by *drashṭā*, "beholder.")

R. V. vi. 14, 2.—*Agnir id hi prachetāḥ Agnir vedhastamaḥ ṛishiḥ* | "Agni is wise; Agni is a most sage *rishi*."

R. V. viii. 6, 41.—*Ṛishir hi pūrvajā asi ekaḥ īśanaḥ ojasā Indra choshkūyase vasu* | "Thou art an anciently-born *rishi*, who alone rulest by thy might; Indra, thou lavishest riches."

R. V. viii. 16, 7.—*Indro brahmā Indraḥ ṛishir Indraḥ purū-puru-hūtaḥ* | *mahān mahībhiḥ śachībhiḥ* | "Indra is a priest, Indra is a *rishi*, Indra is much invoked; he is great through his great exploits."

R. V. ix. 96, 18 (= S. V. ii. 526).—*Ṛishimanā yaḥ ṛishikṛit svarshāḥ sahasranīthaḥ padavīḥ kavīnām* | "Soma, *rishi-minded, rishi-maker*, bestower of good, lord of a thousand songs, the path [leader?] of sages," etc.

R. V. ix. 107, 7.— . . . *Ṛishir vipro vichaxaṇas tvaṁ kavir*

abhavo devavītamaḥ ityādi | "A *rishi*, a sage, intelligent, thou (Soma) wast a poet, most devoted to the gods," etc.

R. V. x. 27, 22.— . . . *Indrāya sunvad ṛishaye cha śixat* | ". . . Let [men] present libations to Indra, and offerings to the *rishi*."

R. V. x. 112, 9.—*Ni shu sīda gaṇapate gaṇeshu tvām āhur vipratamaṁ kavīnām* | *na ṛite tvat kriyate kiñchana āre mahām arkam Maghavanś chitram archa* | "Sit, lord of multitudes, among our multitudes; they call thee the greatest of sages [or poets]; nothing is done without, or apart from, thee; receive, Maghavan, our great and beautiful hymn."

R. V. x. 115, 5.—*Agniḥ kaṇvatamaḥ kaṇva-sakhā ityādi* | "Agni is the greatest of the Kanvas, the friend of Kanva," etc.

II.—The Vedic rishis, as we have seen, expected to receive from their gods every variety of temporal blessings, strength, long life, offspring, riches, cattle, rain, food, and victory, and they also looked for forgiveness of their offences, and exaltation to paradise, to the same benefactors. Hence it would be nothing more than we might have anticipated, if we should further find them asking their different deities to enlighten their minds, to direct their ceremonies, to stimulate their devotion, to augment their powers of poetical expression, and to inspire them with religious fervour for the composition of their hymns. I think the following passages will justify this expectation by showing that the rishis (though, as we have seen, they frequently speak of the hymns as their own work) did also sometimes entertain the idea that their prayers, praises, and ceremonies generally, were supernaturally suggested and directed. One of the modes (if not the principal one) in which this idea is expressed is, as we shall discover, the personification of speech under different appellations. The following are the passages to which I refer: they are—

First, such as refer to the gods generally:

R. V. i. 37, 4.—*Pra vaḥ śardhāya ghṛishvaye tvesha-dyumnāya śushmiṇe* | *brahma devattaṁ gāyata* | "To [that which is] your strength, the vigorous, overpowering, energetic, [host of

Maruts] sing the *god-given* prayer." (See, however, Part Second, p. 219, note 174.)

S. V. i. 299.—*Tvashṭā no daivyaṁ vachaḥ Parjanyo Brahmaṇaspatiḥ | putrair bhrātṛibhir Aditir nu pātu no dushṭaram trāmaṇaṁ vachaḥ* | "May Tvastri, Parjanya, and Brahmanaspati [prosper] our *divine* utterance: may Aditi with her [?] sons and brothers prosper our invincible and protective utterance."

In the next passage, the hymn or prayer is spoken of as *inconceivable*.

R. V. i. 152, 5.—*Achittam brahma jujushur yuvānaḥ pra Mitre dhāma Varuṇe gṛiṇantaḥ* | "The youths received with joy the incomprehensible prayer, celebrating the glorious abode in Mitra and Varuna [?]."

(Though Sāyana, in his comment on this passage, does not give to the word *yuvānaḥ* the sense of youths, he interprets it so, and explains it of the Maruts, in his note on R. V. i. 165, 2.)

In R. V. x. 20, 10, Vimada, a rishi, is connected with the immortals:—*Agne Vimado manīshām ūrjonapād amṛitebhiḥ sajoshā giraḥ āvaxat sumatīr iyānaḥ ityādi* | "O Agni, son of strength, Vimada, united with the immortals, hastening, has brought to thee a product of thought, and beautiful hymns."

In the two following texts the gods are said to have *generated* the hymn or prayer:

R. V. viii. 88, 4.—*Sūkta-vākam prathamam ād id Agnim ād id havir ajanayanta devāḥ | sa eshāṁ yajño abhavat tanūpāḥ* | "The gods first *generated* the hymn, then Agni, then the oblation. This sacrifice was the protector of their life."

R. V. x. 61, 7.— . . . *Svādhyo ajanayan brahma devā Vāstoshpatiṁ vratapāṁ nirataxan* | "The thoughtful gods have *generated* prayer: they have fashioned Vastoshpati the protector of sacred rites."

(Who, however, are the "gods" here intended? The word *deva* is sometimes understood by Sāyana to denote the worshippers; and it may mean no more in these two passages. See Sāyana on R. V. iii. 34, 7, where he makes *devebhyaḥ-devana-śīlebhyaḥ* stotṛibhyaḥ.)

In the latter of the two following verses, *Vāch* (speech) is said to be divine, and to have been *generated* by the gods. Though Speech is here spoken of generally, and nothing is said of the hymns, still these seem to have come to be connected with her in the minds of the Vedic bards, and to be regarded as her most solemn and important expression.

R. V. viii. 89, 10.—*Yad vāg vadantī avichetanāni rāshṭrī devānāṁ nishasāda mandrā | chatasra ūrjaṁ duduhe payāṁsi kva svid asyāḥ paramaṁ jagāma | 11. Devīṁ vācham ajanayanta devās tāṁ viśvarūpāḥ paśavo vadanti | sā no mandrā isham ūrjaṁ duhānā dhenur vāg asmān upa sushṭutā ā etu |* "When Vāch, speaking unintelligible things, queen of the gods, sat down, conferring delight, the four regions milked forth sustenance and waters: whither has her highest station departed? The gods *generated* the divine Vāch; animals of all kinds utter her: may this cow Vāch which brings us joy, and yields us nourishment and sustenance,—approach us, when we celebrate her praises."

The last verse (as well as R. V. viii. 90, 16, which will be quoted below), derives some illustration from the following passage of the Bṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad, p. 982 (p. 251 English trans.), in which also Vāch is designated as a cow:—*Vāchaṁ dhenum upāsīta | tasyāś chatvāraḥ stanāḥ svāhā-kāro vashaṭ-kāro hanta-kāraḥ svadhā-kāraḥ | tasyā dvau stanau devā upajīvanti svāhā-kārañcha vashaṭ-kārañcha hanta-kāram manushyāḥ svadhā-kāram pitaraḥ | tasyāḥ prāṇa ṛishabho mano vatsaḥ |* "Let a man worship the cow Vāch. She has four udders, the formulæ *svāhā, vashat, hanta,* and *svadhā.* The gods live upon her two udders, *svāhā* and *vashaṭ;* men upon *hanta;* and the patriarchs upon *svadhā.* Breath is her bull; the mind, her calf."

(The two verses, R. V. viii. 89, 10 and 11, occur in the Nirukta, xi. 28, 29. Roth (in his Illustrations), p. 152, says the unintelligible utterance of Vāch in verse 10, means thunder. Though this be the case, the word appears to have a more

general signification in the next verse, and to refer to speech in general, personified as a divine being. The speech which all the animals utter cannot of course be thunder.

In some of the preceding verses of this hymn there is a curious reference made to some sceptical doubts regarding the existence of Indra; which I quote here, though unconnected with the present subject. R. V. viii. 89, 3, 4.—*Pra su stomam bharata vājayantam Indrāya satyaṁ yadi satyam asti | na Indro asti iti nema u tva āha ka īṁ dadarśa kam abhi stavāma | Ayam asmi jaritaḥ paśya mā iha viśvā jātāni abhi asmi mahnā | ṛitasya mā pradiśo varddhayanti ādardiro bhuvanā dardarīmi |* "Present to Indra a hymn soliciting food, a true [hymn] if he truly exists. 'Indra does not exist,' says some one: 'who has seen him? whom shall we praise?' 'I am here, worshipper' [answers Indra]; 'behold me, I surpass all creatures in greatness; the different points of the sacrifice augment me; crushing, I destroy the worlds.'")

Second: the next set of passages which I shall bring forward either refer to Sarasvatī, Vāch, Dhishanā, etc. (various names of the goddess of speech, or different personifications of speech, or of prayer), or at least speak of prayer as *divine*.

R. V. i. 3, 11, 12.—*Chodayitrī sūnṛitānāṁ chetantī sumatīnām | yajñaṁ dadhe Sarasvatī | . . . dhiyo viśvā virājati |* "Sarasvatī, who furthers the truthful [or our hymns], and who stimulates the wise [or our prayers], has sustained our sacrifice. . . . She enlightens all intellects."

R. V. i. 22, 10.—*Ā gnāḥ Agne iha avase Hotrāṁ yavishṭha Bhāratīm | Varūtrīṁ Dhishaṇāṁ vaha |* "Bring here, youthful Agni, to our help, the wives [of the gods], Hotrā, Bhāratī, Varūtrī, and Dhishanā."

(*Varūtrī*, "the eligible," may be merely an epithet of Dhishanā which, according to Sāyana = *vāg-devī*, "the goddess of speech."

R. V. i. 31, 11.—*Iḷām akṛiṇvan manushasya śāsanīm ityādi |* "The gods made Ilā to be the instructress of men." (See Pro-

fessor Wilson's note on this passage, p. 82 of his translation of the R. V. vol i.)

R. V. i. 109, 1.— . . . *Na anyā yuvat pramatir asti mahyaṁ sa vāṁ dhiyaṁ vājayantīm ataxam* | 2. . . . *Athā somasya prayatī yuvabhyām Indrāgnī stomaṁ janayāmi navyam* | 4. *Yuvābhyaṁ devī dhishañā madāya Indrāgnī somam uśatī sunoti* | 1. "I have no other wisdom than [that which proceeds] from you (Indra and Agni), I who have *fabricated* for you a hymn supplicating food. 2. . . . I then, together with a libation of soma, *generate* for you, Indra and Agni, a new hymn. 4. The *divine hymn* [*or rite*], longing, pours forth the soma for your exhilaration."

(The wisdom to which the rishi refers at the beginning of this passage does not, however, necessarily, mean the power of composing hymns. In other clauses, this text contains the same words expressive of the *fabrication* and *generation* of the hymns by the rishi, which we have already met with in section 3, pp. 130-136).

R. V. ii. 3, 8.—*Sarasvatī sādhayantī dhiyaṁ naḥ Iḷā devī Bhāratī viśvatūrttiḥ* | *Tisro devīḥ svadhayā barhir edam achhidram pāntū śaraṇaṁ nishadya* | "May Sarasvatī, perfecting our hymn [or rite], may the divine Ilā, and the all-pervading Bhāratī; may these three goddesses, seated on the place of sacrifice, prosper this faultless sacrifice with the oblation."

R. V. iii. 18, 3.— . . . *Yāvad īśe brahmaṇā vandamānaḥ imāṁ dhīyaṁ śata-seyāya devīm* | "Worshipping thee with a prayer according to the best of my power, [I offer?] this *divine* prayer to obtain unbounded wealth."

R. V. iii. 32, 14.—*Vivesha yad mā dhishaṇā jajāna ityādi* | "When the thought [or voice] *entered into* me, I gave it birth," etc. (If *dhishaṇā* here mean "thought," it need not refer to anything supernatural.)

R. V. iv. 34, 1.—*Idā hi vo dhishaṇā devī ahnām adhāt pītim ityādi* | "For on these days the *divine* voice has ordained that you should drink soma," etc.

R. V. iv. 43, 1, 2.—*Ka u śravat katamo yajñiyānāṁ vandāru devaḥ katamo jushāte | kasya imāṁ devīm amṛiteshu preshṭhāṁ hṛidi śreshyāma sushṭutiṁ suhavyām* | "Who will hear us? which of all the objects of adoration? which of all the gods will receive our praises? In the heart of whom among the immortals can we infix this our *divine* and dearest hymn, accompanied by excellent oblations?"

R. V. vii. 34, 1.—*Pra śukrā etu devī manīshā asmat sutashṭo ratho na vājī* | "May prayer, brilliant and *divine*, proceed from us, like a well-fabricated chariot drawn by steeds."

R. V. vii. 34, 9.—*Abhi vo devīṁ dhiyaṁ dadidhvam pra vo devatrā vāchaṁ kṛiṇudhvam* | "Receive towards you the *divine* hymn; proclaim the song for yourselves among the gods."

R. V. vii. 90, 3.— . . . *Rāye devī dhishaṇā dhāti devam* | "The *divine* voice disposes [?] the god to bestow [?] wealth." (This verse is translated by Professor Benfey in his Glossary to the Sāma-veda under the root *vid*, p. 170.)

R. V. vii. 96, 3.—*Bhadram id bhadrā kṛiṇavat Sarasvatī akavārī chetati vājinīvatī | gṛiṇānā Jamadagnivat stuvānā cha Vasishṭhavat* | "May the gracious Sarasvati bless us. The generous [goddess] rich in oblations, stimulates us, when praised after the manner of Jamadagni or lauded after the fashion of Vasishtha."

R. V. viii. 90, 16.—*Vachovidaṁ vācham udīrayantīṁ viśvābhir dhībhir upatishṭhamānām | devīṁ devebhyaḥ pari eyushīṁ gām ā mā avṛikta marttyo dabhrachetāḥ* | "Let not any mortal of little intelligence do violence to the cow, the *divine* Vāch, who is skilled in praise, who utters her voice aloud, who associates with all the gods, and arrives with all the hymns."

R. V. ix. 33, 5.—*Abhi brahmīr anūshata yahvīr ṛitasya mātaro marmṛijyante divaḥ śiśum* | "The great devotional [?] mothers of the sacrifice have uttered praise: they decorate the child of the sky."

R. V. x. 35, 6.— . . . *Rāyo janitrīṁ dhishaṇāṁ upa bruve* | "I address myself to Dhishanā, the generatrix of wealth."

R. V. x. 71, 1 ff.—*Bṛihaspate prathamaṁ vācho agraṁ yat prairata nāmadheyaṁ dadhānāḥ | yad eshāṁ śreshṭhaṁ yad aripram āsīt preṇā tad eshāṁ nihitaṁ guhā āviḥ | 2. Saktum iva titäunā punanto yatra dhīrā manasā vācham akrata | atrā sakhāyaḥ sakhyāni jānate bhadrā eshāṁ laxmīr nihitā adhi vāchi | 3. Yajñena vāchaḥ padavīyam āyan tām anvavindann ṛishishu pravishṭām | tām ābhṛitya vyadadhuḥ purutrā tāṁ sapta rebhā abhi sannavante | 4. Uta tvaḥ paśyan na dadarśa vācham uta tvaḥ śṛiṇvan na śṛiṇoti enām | uto tvasmai tanvaṁ visasre jāyeva patye uśatī suvāsāḥ | 5. Uta tvaṁ sakhye sthirapītam āhur nainaṁ hinvanty api vājineshu | adhenvā charati māyayā esha vāchaṁ śuśruvān aphalām apushpām | 6. Yas tityāja sachividaṁ sakhāyaṁ na tasya vāchi api bhāgo asti | yad īṁ śṛiṇoti alakaṁ śṛiṇoti na hi praveda sukṛitasya panthām |* 1. "O Brihaspati, that first and principal name of speech (Vāch), that which possessing, they uttered aloud [?], that which was to them the most excellent and spotless, that which they had kept secret has, through love, [been made] manifest. 2. Wherever the wise,—cleansing, as it were, meal with a sieve,—have uttered speech with intelligence, their friends recognize [their] friendliness; an auspicious fortune [or sign] is impressed upon their speech. 3. Through sacrifice they followed the track of Vāch, *and found her entered into the rishis:* bearing her, they divided her into many portions: her the seven poets celebrate. 4. One man, seeing, sees not Vāch; hearing, he hears her not; to another she reveals her form, as an elegantly attired and loving wife displays her person to her husband. 5. They say that one man has a sure defence in [her] friendship; men cannot injure him even in battle; but that man consorts with an unprofitable delusion who has [only] heard speech [Vāch] which is [to him] without fruit or flower. 6. He who has abandoned his discerning friend, has no portion in Vāch; whatever he hears he hears in vain; he knows not the path of virtue."

(The second, fourth, and fifth verses of this obscure hymn are quoted in the Nirukta, iv. 10; i. 19, and 20; and are explained

in Professor Roth's Illustrations. Verses 2 and 4 are also quoted and interpreted in the Mahābhāshya; see pp. 30 and 31 of Dr. Ballantyne's edition. The verse which is of most importance for my present purpose, is, however, the third, which speaks of Vāch having *entered into the rishis*. The idea of Vāch being divided into many portions will be found again below in R. V. x. 125, 3.)

R. V. x. 96, 10.— . . . *Mahī chid hi dhishaṇā aharyad ityādi* | "The great voice [or hymn] has desired thee."

R. V. x. 110, 8 (= Vāj. S. 29, 33).—*Ā no yajñam Bhāratī tūyam etu Iḷā manushvad iha chetayantī* | *tisro devīr barhir ā idam syonaṁ Sarasvatī svapasaḥ sadantu* | "Let Bhāratī come quickly here to our sacrifice, with Ilā, who instructs us like Manu [or like a man], and with Sarasvatī: let these three goddesses, skilful in rites, sit down upon this beautiful sacrificial grass."

R. V. x. 125, 3.—*Ahaṁ rāshṭrī saṅgamanī vasūnāṁ chikitushī prathamā yajñiyānām* | *tām mā devā vyadadhuḥ purutrā bhūristhātrām bhūri āveśayantīm* | 4. *Mayā so annam atti yo vipaśyati yaḥ prāṇiti ya īṁ śṛiṇoti uktam* | *amantavo māṁ te upakṣiyanti śrudhi śruta śraddhivaṁ te vadāmi* | 5. *Aham eva svayam idaṁ vadāmi jushṭaṁ devebhir uta mānushebhiḥ* | *yaṁ kāmaye taṁ tam ugraṁ kṛiṇomi tam brahmāṇaṁ tam ṛishiṁ taṁ sumedhām* | 3. "I am the queen, the centre of riches, intelligent, the first of the objects of adoration: the gods have separated me into many portions, have assigned me many abodes, and made me widely pervading. 4. He who has insight, who lives, who hears [my] sayings, eats through me [the sacred] food. Those men who are foolish destroy me, [or, those who disregard me, perish]. Listen, thou who art learned, I declare to thee what is worthy of belief. 5. I myself make known this which is agreeable both to gods and men. Him whom I love I make terrible, [I make] him a priest, [I make] *him a rishi*, [I make] him intelligent." (This passage occurs also in the Atharva-veda, iv. 30, 2 ff., but with some

various readings, as *āveśayantaḥ* for *āveśayantīm*, and *śraddheyam* for *śraddhivam*, etc. The hymn is translated by Mr. Colebrooke, Ess. i. 32, or p. 16 of W. and N.'s ed.)

R. V. x. 176, 2.—*Pra devaṁ devyā dhiyā bharata Jātavedasam havyā no vaxad ānushak* | "By *divine prayer* produce Jātavedas: may he present our oblations in order."

R. V. x. 177, 1.—*Pataṇgam aktam asurasya māyayā hṛidā paśyanti manasā vipaśchitaḥ* | *samudre antaḥ kavayo vichaxate marīchīnām padam ichhanti vedhasaḥ* | 2. *Pataṇgo vācham manasā bibhartti tāṁ Gandharvo avadad garbhe antaḥ* | *tāṁ dyotamānāṁ svaryam manīshām ṛitasya pade kavayo nipānti* | "Sages behold with the heart and mind the Bird enveloped by the wisdom of the Asura: the wise perceive him in the sky: the prudent seek after the abode of his rays. 2. The Bird cherishes speech with his mind: the Gandharva hath uttered her in the womb: the bards preserve in the place of sacred rites this shining and celestial intellect." (See also R. V. x. 189, 3, *vāk pataṇgāya dhīyate*.)

Third: I shall now adduce the passages in which other Vedic deities, whether singly or in concert, are spoken of as concerned in the production of the hymns.

Aditi.—In R. V. viii. 12, 14, Aditi is mentioned as fulfilling this function: *Yad uta svarāje Aditiḥ stomam Indrāya jījanat puru-praśastam ūtaye ityādi* | "When Aditi *generated* for the self-resplendent Indra a hymn abounding in praises, to supplicate succour," etc.

Agni.—R. V. i. 18, 6, 7.—*Sadasaspatim abhutam priyam Indrasya kāmyam* | *sanim medhām ayāsisham* | *yasmād ṛite na siddhyati yajño vipaśchitaś chana* | *sa dhīnāṁ yogam invati* | 6. "I have resorted, for wisdom, to Sadasaspati (Agni), the wonderful, the dear, the beloved of Indra, the beneficent; (7) without whom the sacrifice of the wise does not succeed: he promotes the course of our ceremonies."

R. V. iv. 5, 3.—*Sāma dvibarhā mahi tigma-bhṛishṭiḥ sahasra-retā vṛishabhas tuvishmān* | *padaṁ na gor apagūḷhaṁ vividvān*

Agnir mahyaṁ pra id u vochad manīshām | 6. *Idam me Agne kiyate pāvaka aminate gurum bhāraṁ na manma* | *Vṛihad dadhātha dhṛishatā gabhīraṁ yahvam pṛishṭham prayasā saptadhātu* | "Agni occupying two positions, the fierce-flaming, the prolific, the showerer of benefits, the opulent, who knows the sacred hymn, mysterious as the track of a [missing cow], has declared to me the knowledge [of it]. 6. To me who am feeble, though innoxious, thou, o Agni, purifier, hast given, as a heavy load, this great, profound, and extensive hymn, of seven elements, with efficacious oblations." (I find a difficulty, even with the help of Sāyana's Commentary, in translating the remaining word of this verse, *pṛishṭham*. See Part Second, p. 489.)

R. V. iv. 6, 1.—*Tvaṁ hi viśvam abhi asi manma pra vedhasaś chit tirasi manīshām* | "Thou presidest over all thoughts [or prayers]; thou promotest the praises of the sage."

R. V. iv. 11, 3.—*Tvad Agne kāvyā tvad manīshās tvad ukthā jāyante rādhyāni* | "From thee, Agni, proceed poetic thoughts; from thee the products of the mind; from thee effective hymns."

R. V. x. 21, 5.—*Agnir jāto Atharvaṇā vidad viśvāni kāvyā* | "Agni, generated by Atharvan, is acquainted with all wisdom."

R. V. x. 91, 8.— . . . *Medhākāraṁ vidathasya prasādhanam Agnim ityādi* | "Agni, the giver of understanding, the accomplisher of sacrifice."

R. V. x. 4, 5.—*Yad vo vayam praminmāmo vratāni vidushāṁ devā avidustarāsaḥ* | *Agnis tad viśvam āpriṇāti vidvān yebhir devān ṛitubhiḥ kalpayāti* | *Yat pākatrā manasā dānadaxā na yajñasya manvate martyāsaḥ* | *Agnis tad hotā kratuvid vijānan yajishṭho devān ṛituśo yajāti* | "When, o [ye] gods, we, the most unwise among the wise, undertake sacred rites in your honour, the wise Agni completes them all, at the stated seasons which he assigns to the gods. When men, devoted to sacrifice, do not, from their ignorance, rightly comprehend the mode of worship, Agni, the skilful sacrificer, and most eminent of priests, knowing the ceremonial, worships the gods at the proper seasons."

(As rites and hymns were closely united in the practice of the

early Indians, and are often expressed by the same words; if Agni was supposed to be the director of the one, viz., the oblations, he might easily come to be also regarded as aiding in the production of the other—the hymns. Verse 4, occurs also in the A. V. xix. 59, 1, 2, where, however, *āpṛiṇātu* is read instead of *āpṛiṇāti*, and in place of the words *yebhir devān*, etc., at the close of the verse, we have, *somaścha yo brāhmaṇān ā viveśa* | "and Soma, who entered into the priests.")

Brahmaṇaspati.—R. V. i. 40, 5, 6.—*Pra nūnam Brahmaṇaspatir mantraṁ vadati ukthyam* | *yasminn Indro Varuṇo Mitraḥ Aryamā devā okāṁsi chakrire* | *Tam id vochema vidatheshu śambhuvam mantraṁ devā anehasam ityādi* | "Brahmanaspati (abiding in the worshipper's mouth, according to the scholiast) utters the hymn accompanied with praise, in which the gods, Indra, Varuna, Mitra, and Aryaman, have made their abode. Let us utter, gods, at sacrifices, that spotless hymn, conferring felicity." (Roth in his Lexicon considers *okas* to mean "good pleasure," "satisfaction." See also his Essay on Brahma and the Brahmans, Jour. of the Germ. Or. Soc. i. 74.)

Bṛihaspati.—R. V. ii. 23, 2.—*Usrāḥ iva sūryo jyotishā maho viśveshām ij janitā brahmaṇām asi* | "As the glorious sun by his lustre generates rays, so art thou (Bṛihaspati) the *generator* of all prayers."

Gandharva.—According to Professor Roth (see under the word in his Lexicon), the Gandharva is represented in the Veda as a deity who knows and reveals the secrets of heaven, and divine truths in general; in proof of which he quotes the following texts:—

R. V. x. 139, 5.—*Viśvāvasur abhi tad no gṛiṇātu divyo Gandharvo rajaso vimānaḥ* | *Yad vā ghā satyam uta yad na vidma dhiyo hinvāno dhiyaḥ id naḥ avyāḥ* | "May the celestial Gandharva Visvāvasu, who is the measurer of the atmosphere, declare to us that which is true, or which we know not. May he receive and delight in our hymns, [or, stimulating our interests, may he prosper our hymns]."

A. V. ii. 1, 2.—*Pra tad voched amṛitasya vidvān Gandharvo dhāma paramaṁ guhā yat* | "May the Gandharva, who knows the world of the immortals, declare to us that supreme and mysterious abode."

Indra.—R. V. iii. 54, 17.—*Mahat tad vaḥ kavayaś chāru nāma yad ha devā bhavatha viśve Indre* | *sakhā Ṛibhubhiḥ puruhūta priyebhir imāṁ dhiyaṁ sātaye taxatā naḥ* | "Great, o sage [Aśvins], is that cherished name of yours, through which [or, that] ye all become gods with (in) Indra. Do thou, much invoked (Indra), our friend, with the beloved Ribhus, *fabricate* (or dispose) this hymn for our welfare." (This may merely mean that Indra was asked to give a favourable issue to the prayer of the worshipper, not to *compose* his hymn for him. See Roth's Lexicon, under the word *tax*, 3.)

R. V. vi. 26, 3.—*Tvaṁ kaviṁ chodayaḥ arkasātāv ityādi* | "Thou (Indra) didst stimulate the poet in the composition of his hymns," etc. (Sāyana renders *arkasātau*, "for the sake of finding food.")

R. V. vi. 18, 15.—*Kṛishvā kṛitno akṛitaṁ yat te asti ukthaṁ navīyo janayasva yajñaiḥ* | "Energetic (Indra), do what thou hast never yet done; *generate* a new song with the sacrifices."

R. V. vi. 34, 1.—*Saṁ cha tve jagmur giraḥ Indra pūrvīr vi cha tvad yanti vibhvo manīshāḥ* | "Many hymns are congregated in thee, o Indra, and numerous products of the mind issue from thee." (This verse has been already quoted in p. 124.)

R. V. vi. 47, 10.—*Indra mṛiḷa mahyaṁ jīvātum ichcha chodāya dhiyam ayaso na dhārām* | *Yat kiñcha ahaṁ tvāyur idaṁ vadāmi taj jushasva kṛidhi mā devavantam* | "O Indra, gladden me, decree life for me, *sharpen my intellect* like the edge of an iron instrument. Whatever I, longing for thee, now utter, do thou accept; give me divine protection." (Compare with the word *chodaya* the use of the word *prachodayāt* in the Gāyatrī, R. V. iii. 62, 10, which will be given below.)

R. V. vii. 97. 3.—*Tam u namasā havirbhiḥ suśevam Brahmaṇaspatiṁ gṛiṇīshe* | *Indraṁ śloko mahi daivyaḥ sishaktu yo*

brahmaṇo devakṛitasya rājā | 5. *Tam ā no arkam amṛitāya jushṭam ime dhāsur amṛitāsaḥ purājāḥ ityādi* | "3. I invoke with reverence and with offerings the beneficent Brahmanaspati. Let a great and *divine* song celebrate Indra, who is king of the prayer *made by the devas*. 5. May these ancient immortals make this our hymn acceptable to the immortal," etc. (Are we to understand the word *deva* here of *gods* or *priests?*)

R. V. viii. 13, 7.—*Pratnavaj janaya giraḥ sṛiṇudhi jaritur havam* | "As of old, *generate* hymns; hear the invocation of thy worshipper."

R. V. x. 112, 9.—*Ni shu sīda gaṇapate gaṇeshu tvām āhur vipratamaṁ kavīnām* | *na ṛite tvat kriyate kiñchana āre mahām arkam Maghavan chitram archa* | "Lord of assemblies, sit amid our multitudes; they call thee the wisest of poets. *Nothing is done without, or apart from thee;* Maghavan, receive with favour our great and beautiful hymn." (Already quoted in p. 148.)

Indra and Vishnu.—R. V. vi. 69, 2.—*Yā viśvāsāṁ janitārā matīnām Indrā-Vishṇū kalaśā soma-dhānā* | *Pra vāṁ giraḥ śasyamānāḥ avantu pra stomāso gīyamānāsaḥ arkaiḥ* | "Indra and Vishnu, ye who are the *generators* of all hymns, who are the vessels into which soma is poured, may the praises which are now recited gratify you, and the songs which are chaunted with encomiums."

Indra and Varuna.—The following passage is not, properly speaking, a portion of the Rig-veda, as it is part of one of the Vālakhilyas or apocryphal additions (described in Part Second, p. 210), which are found inserted between the 48th and 49th hymns of the 8th Mandala. From its style, however, it appears to be nearly as old as some parts of the R. V.

Indrāvaruṇā yad ṛishibhyo manīshāṁ vācho matiṁ śrutam adattam agre | *yāni sthānāny asṛijanta dhīrā yajñaṁ tanvānās tapasā 'bhyapaśyam* | "Indra and Varuna, I have *seen* through *devotion* that which *ye formerly gave* to the rishis, wisdom, understanding of speech, sacred lore, and all the places which the sages created, when performing sacrifice." (See Part Second, p. 220.)

Pūshan.—R. V. x. 26, 4.—*Maṁsīmahi tvā vayam asmākaṁ deva Pūshan matīnāṁcha sādhanam viprāṇāṁcha ādhavam* | "We adore thee, divine Pushan, the accomplisher of our hymns, and the stimulator of sages."

Savitṛi.—R. V. iii. 62 (= S. V. ii. 812, and Vāj. S. iii. 35).—*Tat Savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmahi* | *dhiyo yo naḥ prachodayāt* | "We meditate that excellent glory of the divine Savitṛi; may he stimulate our understandings [or hymns, or rites]."

(This is the celebrated Gāyatrī, the most sacred of all the texts in the Veda. See Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. pp. 29, 30, 127, and 175; or pp. 14, 15, 78, and 109 of W. and N.'s ed. Benfey (S. V. p. 277) translates the Gāyatrī thus: "May we receive the glorious brightness of this, the generator, of the god who shall prosper our works."

The Linga Purana (Part II. sec. 48, 5 ff., Bombay lithographed ed.) gives the following "varieties" of the Gāyatrī, adapted to modern Śaiva worship: *Gāyatrī-bhedāḥ* || *Tatpurushāya vidmahe vāg-viśuddhāya dhīmahi* | *Tan naḥ Śivaḥ prachodayāt* || *Gaṇāmbikāyai vidmahe karmasiddhyai cha dhīmahi* | *Tan no Gaurī prachodayāt* || *Tatpurushāya vidmahe Mahādevāya dhīmahi* | *Tan no Rudraḥ prachodayāt* || *Tatpurushāya vidmahe Vaktratuṇḍāya dhīmahi* | *Tan no Dantiḥ prachodayāt* || *Mahāsenāya vidmahe vāgviśuddhāya dhīmahi* | *Tan naḥ Skandaḥ prachodayāt* || *Tīxṇaśṛiṇgāya vidmahe Vedapādāya dhīmahi* | *Tan no Vṛishaḥ prachodayād ityādi* | "(1) We contemplate That Purusha, we meditate him who is pure in word [or purified by the word]; may That Śiva stimulate us. (2) We contemplate Ganāmbikā, and we meditate Karmasiddhi (the accomplishment of works); may That Gaurī stimulate us. (3) We contemplate That Purusha, and we meditate Mahādeva; may That Rudra stimulate us. (4) We contemplate That Purusha, and we meditate Vaktratunda (Ganeśa); may That Danti (the elephant) stimulate us. (5) We contemplate Mahāsena (Kārtikeya), and we meditate him who is pure in word; may That

44

Skanda stimulate us. (6) We contemplate Tīxnasringa (the sharp-horned), and we meditate the Veda-footed; may Vrisha (the bull) stimulate us."

Soma.—R. V. vi. 47, 3.—*Ayam me pītaḥ udiyartti vācham ayam manīshām uśatīm ajīgaḥ* | "This [soma], when drunk, stimulates my speech [or hymn]; this called forth the ardent thought."

It may be said that this and the other following texts relating to soma, should not be quoted as proofs that any idea of divine inspiration was entertained by the ancient Indian bards, as they can mean nothing more than that the rishis were sensible of a stimulating effect on their thoughts and powers of expression, produced by the exhilarating draughts of the juice of that plant in which they indulged. But the rishis had come to regard Soma as a god, and apparently to be passionately devoted to his worship. See Part Second, pp. 470 ff., and especially pp. 474, 475.

A. V. viii. 48, 3.—*Apāma somam amṛitā abhūma aganma jyotir avidāma devān* | *kiṁ nūnam asmān kṛiṇavad arātiḥ kim u dhūrttir amṛita martyasya* | "We have drunk the soma, we have become immortal, we have entered into light, we have known the gods; what can an enemy now do to us? what can the malice of any mortal effect, o immortal god?"

(This passage is quoted in the commentary of Gauḍapāda on the Sānkhya Kārikā, verse 2, and is translated (incorrectly as regards the last clause), by Prof. Wilson, in p. 13 of his English version.)

A curious parallel to this last Vedic text is to be found in the satyrical drama of Euripides, the Cyclops, 578 ff.; though here, of course, the object is merely to depict the drunken elevation of the monster Polyphemus:

> Ὁ δ' οὐρανός μοι συμμεμιγμένος δοκεῖ
> Τῇ γῇ φέρεσθαι, τοῦ Διός τε τὸν θρόνον
> Λεύσσω τὸ πᾶν τε δαιμόνων ἀγνὸν σέβας.

> "The sky, commingled with the earth, appears
> To whirl around; I see the throne of Jove,
> And all the awful glory of the gods."

R. V. ix. 25, 5.—*Arusho janayan giraḥ somaḥ pavate āyushag Indraṁ gachchan kavikratuḥ* | "The ruddy Soma, sage, united with men, purifies us, *generating hymns*, resorting to Indra."

R. V. ix. 76, 4.— . . . *Pitā matīnām asamashta-kāvyaḥ* | "[Soma] father of our hymns, of incomparable wisdom."

R. V. ix. 95, 2.—*Hariḥ sṛijānaḥ pathyām ṛitasya iyartti vācham ariteva nāvam* | *devo devānāṁ guhyāni nāma āvishkṛiṇoti barhishi pravāche* | "The golden [Soma] when poured out, sends forth the hymn, [or, his voice], the companion of the ceremony, as a rower propels a boat. A god, he reveals the mysterious names of the gods to the bard upon the sacred grass." (See R. V. ii. 42, 1, and x. 116, 9, quoted in p. 137).

R. V. ix. 96, 5 (= S. V. ii. 293-5).—*Somaḥ pavate janitā matīnāṁ janitā divo janitā pṛithivyā janitā Agner janitā sūryasya janitā Indrasya janitā uta Vishṇoḥ* | 6. *Brahmā devānām padavīḥ kavīnām ṛishir viprāṇām mahisho mṛigāṇāṁ śyeno gṛidhrāṇāṁ svadhitir vanānāṁ somaḥ pavitram ati eti rebhan* | 7. *Prāvīvipad vāchaḥ ūrmiṁ na sindhur giraḥ somaḥ pavamāno manīshāḥ ityādi* | "Soma purifies us, he who is the *generator* of hymns, of the sky, of the earth, of fire, of the sun, of Indra, and of Vishnu. 6. Soma, who is Brahmā among the gods, a leader among the poets, a rishi among sages, a buffalo among wild beasts, a falcon among vultures, an axe amid the forests, advances to the filter with a sound. The purifying soma, like the sea rolling its waves, has poured forth songs, hymns, and thoughts," etc. (See Benfey's translation of this passage in his Sāma-veda, pp. 238 and 253.)

Varuna.—R. V. viii. 41, 5, 6.—*Yo dharttā bhuvanānāṁ ya usrāṇām apīchyā veda nāmāni guhyā* | *sa kaviḥ kāvyā puru rūpam dyaur iva pushyati . . .* | *Yasmin viśvāni kāvyā chakre nābhir iva śritā ityādi* | "He who is the upholder of the worlds (Varuna), who knows the secret and mysterious names of the cows, he, a sage [or poet], cherishes sage [or poetical] works, as the sky does many forms. . . . . In him all sage [or poetical]

works abide, as the nave within a wheel," etc. (See R. V. vii. 87, 4, in p. 144, and ix. 95, 2, above, p. 163.)

Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman.—R. V. vii. 66, 11.—*Vi ye dadhuḥ śaradam māsam ād ahar yajñam aktuṁ cha ād ṛicham anāpyam Varuṇo Mitraḥ Aryamā xatraṁ rājānaḥ āśata* | "The kings, Varuna, Mitra, and Aryaman, who made the autumn, the month, the day, the sacrifice, night, and the *Ṛik*, possess an invincible power."

The following passage of the Rig-veda has (as we have seen above, p. 51, note 37; and p. 58), been quoted by Indian commentators and aphorists to prove the eternity of the Veda, on its own authority:

R. V. viii. 64, 6.—*Tasmai nūnam abhidyave vāchā Virūpa nityayā vṛishṇe chodasva sushṭutim* | "Send forth praises, Virūpa, to this heaven-aspiring and prolific Agni, *with perpetual voice.*"

There is, however, no reason whatever to suppose that the words *nityayā vāchā* mean anything more than *perpetual voice.* There is no ground for imagining that the rishi entertained any such conception as became current among the systematic theologians of later times, that his words were eternal. The word *nitya* is used in the same sense "*perpetual*" in R. V. ix. 12, 7 (= S. V. ii. 55, 2), where it is said of Soma, *nityastotro vanaspatir dhīnām antar ityādi* | "The monarch of the woods, *continually-praised,* among the hymns," etc., as well as in the two following texts:

R. V. ix. 92, 3.—*Somaḥ punānaḥ sadaḥ eti nityam ityādi* | "The pure Soma comes to his *perpetual* abode [or to his abode *continually*]," etc.

R. V. x. 39, 14 (quoted above, p. 132).—*Nityāṁ na sūnuṁ tanayaṁ dadhānāḥ* | "Continuing the series like an *unbroken* line of descendants."

The tenor of the numerous texts adduced in this Section seems

clearly to establish the fact that some at least of the ancient Indian rishis conceived themselves to be prompted and directed, in the composition of their hymns and prayers, by supernatural aid, derived from various deities of their pantheon. It may add force to the proof derived from these texts, and show that I am the less likely to have misunderstood their purport and spirit, if I adduce some evidence that a similar conception was not unknown in another region of the ancient Indo-Germanic world, and that the expressions in which the early Grecian bards laid claim to an inspiration descending from the Muses, or from Apollo, were not mere figures of speech, but significant, originally, of a living belief. Most of the following passages, from Hesiod and Homer, in which this idea is enunciated, are referred to in Mr. Grote's History of Greece, i. 478.

Hesiod, Theogonia, 22 :—

Αἰ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδὴν
Ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὕπο ζαθέοιο.
Τόνδε δέ με πρώτιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπαν,
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διος αἰγιόχοιο.
Ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
Ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
Ἴδμεν δ', ἢυτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι.
Ὣς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διος ἀρτιέπειαι·
Καί μοι σκῆπτρον ἔδον, δάφνης ἐριθηλέος ὄζον,
Δρέψασαι θηητόν· ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν
Θείην, ὡς κλείοιμι τά τ' ἐσσόμενα, πρό τ' ἐόντα,
Καί με κέλονθ' ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων,
Σφᾶς τ' αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστερον αἰὲν ἀείδειν.

"Hesiod erst was instructed in beautiful song by the Muses,
Once as he tended his lambs under glorious Helicon's summit.
Me then the goddesses first, the Olympian Muses, accosted:
This was the word which those daughters of Jupiter spake in my hearing:
'Ye who abide in the fields, ye contemptible, gluttonous shepherds,
Full many tales we can tell which are feigned, though they seem to be real;
But we are skilled, when we please, to relate the reality also.'
Thus, very fluent in speech, mighty Jupiter's daughters addressed me.
Straightway then plucking a branch of luxuriant laurel, the Muses
Gave it to me for a staff, and *inspired me with speech superhuman*,
Fitting me thus to make known both the future and also the bygone.
Next they enjoined me to hymn the immortals, unchangeably blessed,
Chiefly, however, to sing their own praises, beginning and ending."

Hesiod, Theogonia, 94 :—

Ἐκ γὰρ Μουσάων καὶ ἑκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
Ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κιθαρισταί,
Ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες.

"Minstrels who come to this earth, as well as all tuneful musicians,
Spring from the heavenly Muses, and from the far-darting Apollo:
Kings are from Jupiter sprung."

The following are the words in which the author of the Iliad invokes the aid of the Muses, to qualify him for enumerating the generals of the Grecian host (Iliad, ii. 484) :—

Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δωμάτ' ἔχουσαι,
Ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστε τε πάντα,
Ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν.

"Tell to me now, o ye Muses, who dwell in Olympian mansions,
Ye who are goddesses, present, and knowing all things which befall men,
Things of which we may hear rumours, but never get accurate knowledge—
Tell to me who were commanders and chiefs of the Grecian army."

But the Muses could also take away, as well as impart, the gift of song, as appears from Iliad, ii. 594 ff.

Ἔνθα τε Μοῦσαι
Ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς·
Στεῦτο γὰρ ἐυχόμενος νικησέμεν, εἴπερ ἂν αὐταὶ
Μοῦσαι ἀείδοιεν, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
Αἱ δὲ χολωσάμεναι πηρὸν θέσαν, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὴν
Θεσπεσίην ἀφέλοντο, καὶ ἐκλέλαθον κιθαριστύν.

"That was the spot where the Muses
Thracian Thamyris met, when they stopped his career as a minstrel.
Boastingly he had affirmed that, if even the heavenly Muses,
Daughters of Jove, should compete, he would bear off the laurels for singing.
Hotly indignant, they smote him with blindness, and took away from him
Minstrelsy, science divine, and his skill in melodious music."

The following passages from the Odyssey refer to Demodocus, the bard who sang at the court of Alcinous, King of the Phæacians (Odyssey, viii. 43 ff.) :—

Καλέσασθε δὲ θεῖον ἀοιδόν,
Δημόδοκον· τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδήν,
Τέρπειν, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν ἀείδειν.

"And summon Demodocus hither,
Minstrel divine, whom the *god hath endowed* with most exquisite science,
Charming, whenever his spirit impels him to sing for our pleasure."

Odyssey, viii. 62 ff.—

Κῆρυξ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθεν ἄγων ἐρίηρον ἀοιδὸν·
Τὸν πέρι Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε, δίδου δ' ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε,
Ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε δίδου δ' ἡδεῖαν ἀοιδήν.

"Afterward nigh came the herald, conducting the loveable minstrel.
Him the Muse tenderly loved, but she dealt him good mingled with evil;
Eyesight she took from him, while she *assigned him sweet song* in requital."

Odyssey, viii. 73—

Μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν κ.τ.λ.

"Next the Muse *stirred up* the bard to resound the achievements of heroes."

A little further on, Ulysses says of Demodocus (Odyssey, viii. 479 ff.):—

Πᾶσι γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδοὶ
Τιμῆς ἔμμοροί εἰσι καὶ αἰδοῦς, ὅυνεκ' ἄρα σφέας
Οἴμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δὲ φῦλον ἀοιδῶν.

"All men who dwell upon earth stand in awe of, and honour, their minstrels,
Since the Muse *teaches them lays*, and looks on the tribe with affection."

And again he addresses him thus (Odyssey, viii. 487):—

Δημόδοκ', ἔξοχα δή σε βροτῶν αἰνίζομ' ἁπάντων.
Ἢ σέ γε Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε Διὸς πᾶις, ἢ σέ γ' Ἀπόλλων.
Λίην γὰρ κατὰ κόσμον Ἀχαιῶν ὅιτον ἀείδεις, κ.τ.λ.

"Happy I deem thee, Demodocus, far above all other mortals.
Either the Muse, Jove's daughter, *hath taught thee*, or Phœbus Apollo;
Such the exactness with which thou relatest the fate of the Argives."[3]

Phemius, the Ithacan minstrel, thus supplicates Ulysses to spare his life (Odyssey, xxii. 345 ff.):—

Αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται, ἔικεν ἀοιδόν
Πέφνης, ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀείδω.
Αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμὶ, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν ὅιμας
Παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν.

"Afterward, thou thyself shalt lament if thou slayest the minstrel,—
Me, who sing praise to the gods, and delight mankind with my legends.
Self-instructed am I, but a *god hath implanted* within me
All kinds of narrative lore."

[3] "That is," says Mr. Grote, "Demodocus has either been inspired as a poet by the muse, or as a prophet by Apollo, for the Homeric Apollo is not the god of song. Kalchas, the prophet, receives his inspiration from Apollo, who confers upon him the same knowledge, both of past and future, as the Muses give to Hesiod." But does not this passage itself (Odyssey viii. 488) show that the Homeric Apollo was the god of song, as well as the bestower of prophetic intuition? and do we not learn the same from Iliad, i. 603? In any case, it is quite clear from Theog. 94, quoted above, that Hesiod regarded Apollo in this character.

The early Greeks believed that the gift of prophecy also, as well as that of song, was imparted by the gods to mortals. This appears from the following passage of Homer (Iliad, i. 69) :—

Κάλχας Θεστορίδης, οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος,
Ὃς ἤδη τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα, πρό τ' ἐόντα,
Καὶ νήεσσ' ἡγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον ἔισω,
Ἧν διὰ μαντοσύνην, τήν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

"Calchas, the great son of Thestor, all other diviners excelling,
Skilled in the present, foreseeing the future, and knowing the bygone;
Guide of the Grecian gallies from Hellas to Ilion's roadstead,
Thanks to that power of divining which *Phœbus Apollo imparted.*"

It is well argued by Mr. Grote that the early Greeks really believed in the inspiration of their bards by the Muses (History of Greece, i. 477 ff.) :—

"His [the early Greek's] faith is ready, literal and uninquiring, apart from all thought of discriminating fact from fiction, or of detecting hidden and symbolized meaning: it is enough that what he hears be intrinsically plausible and seductive, and that there be no special cause to provoke doubt. And if indeed there were, the poet overrules such doubts by the holy and all-sufficient authority of the Muse, whose omniscience is the warrant for his recital, as her inspiration is the cause of his success. The state of mind, and the relation of speaker to hearers, thus depicted, stand clearly marked in the terms and tenor of the ancient epic, if we only put a plain meaning upon what we read. The poet—like the prophet, whom he so much resembles — sings under heavenly guidance, inspired by the goddess to whom he has prayed for her assisting impulse. She puts the word into his mouth and the incidents into his mind; he is a privileged man, chosen as her organ, and speaking from her revelations. As the Muse grants the gift of song to whom she will, so she sometimes in her anger snatches it away, and the most consummate human genius is then left silent and helpless. It is true that these expressions, of the Muse inspiring,

and the poet singing, a tale of past times, have passed from the ancient epic to compositions produced under very different circumstances, and have now degenerated into unmeaning forms of speech; but they gained currency originally in their genuine and literal acceptation. If poets had from the beginning written or recited, the predicate of singing would never have been ascribed to them; nor would it ever have become customary to employ the name of the Muse as a die to be stamped on licensed fiction, unless the practice had begun when her agency was invoked and hailed in perfect good faith. Belief, the fruit of deliberate inquiry, and a rational scrutiny of evidence, is in such an age unknown; the simple faith of the time slides in unconsciously, when the imagination and feeling are exalted; and inspired authority is at once understood, easily admitted, and implicitly confided in."

If we extend our researches over the pages of Homer, we shall speedily discover numerous other instances of divine interference in human affairs, not merely (1) in the *general* government of the world, in the distribution of good and evil, and the allotment of the diversified gifts, intellectual, moral, and physical, which constitute the innumerable varieties of human condition, but also (2) in the way of *special* suggestion, guidance, encouragement, and protection, afforded to individuals.

Illustrations of the general control exercised by the gods over the fortunes of mankind may be found in the following passages of the Iliad, xiii. 730 ff., and of the Odyssey, i. 347 f.; iv. 236 f.; vi. 188 f.; viii. 167-175; xvii. 218, 485 ff.

The following are illustrations of the *special* interference of the gods in behalf of their favourites:—Iliad, i. 194 ff., 218; iii. 380 ff.; v. 1 ff.; vii. 272; xiii. 60 f., 435; xvi. 788 ff.:—Odyssey, i. 319 ff.; iii. 26 ff.; xiv. 216 f., 227; xvi. 159 ff.[4] Of the latter class of passages, I quote two specimens.

[4] Compare Prof. Blackie's dissertation on the theology of Homer in the "Classical Museum," vol. vii. pp. 414 ff.

Odyssey, i. 319 ff.—

> Ἡ μὲν ἄρ ὣς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
> Ὄρνις δ' ὣς ἀνοπαῖα διέπτατο· τῷ δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
> Θῆκε μένος καὶ θάρσος, ὑπέμνησέν τέ ἑ πατρός
> Μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν· ὁ δὲ φρεσὶν ᾗσι νοήσας
> Θάμβησεν κατὰ θυμόν, ὄΐσατο γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι.

"Thus having spoken, the goddess, the keen-eyed Athene departed,
Flying aloft like a bird, unobserved: but to him she *implanted*
Courage and strength in his soul, and reminded him then of his father
Far more strongly than ever: he then, perceiving the marvel,
Wondered exceedingly, thinking a god must have been his adviser.

When Telemachus urges his youth and inexperience as a reason for diffidence in approaching Nestor, Minerva says to him (Odyssey iii. 26) :—

> Τηλέμαχ', ἄλλα μὲν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῇσι νοήσεις,
> Ἄλλα δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθήσεται· οὐ γὰρ οἴω
> Οὐ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε.

"Some things thou thyself shalt perceive in thine own understanding;
Others, again, some *god will suggest* to thy spirit, for never
Hast thou been born, or bred up, except by celestial permission."

These passages, however, afford only one exemplification of the idea which runs through, and in fact, created, the entire mythology of the Greeks, viz., that all the departments of life and of nature were animated, controlled, and governed by particular deities, by whom they were represented, and in whom they were personified.

The Indian mythology,—as is evident to every reader of the Vedas, as well as (to some extent) to the student of the Puranas,—is distinguished by the same tendency as the Grecian. Indra, Agni, Vāyu, Varuna, Sūrya, and many other gods are nothing else than personifications of the elements, while Vāch or Sarasvatī and some other deities, represent either the divine reason by which the more gifted men were supposed to be inspired, or some mental function, or ceremonial abstraction.

In the later religious history, however, of the two races, the Hellenic and the Indian, there is in one respect a remarkable divergence. Though the priestesses of the different oracles,

and perhaps some other pretenders to prophetical intuition, were popularly regarded as speaking by a divine impulse,[5] the idea of inspiration as attaching to poems or other compositions of a religious, didactic, or philosophical character, very soon became extinct. The Greeks had no sacred Scriptures. Their philosophers spoke and wrote in dependance on their own reason alone. They never professed to be guided by any supernatural assistance, nor claimed any divine authority for their dogmas. Nor was any such character of infallibility ever claimed for any of them by their successors.

In India, on the other hand, the indistinct, and perhaps hesitating, belief which some of the ancient rishis seem to have entertained in their own inspiration was not suffered to die out in the minds of later generations. On the contrary this belief grew up by degrees into a fixed persuasion that all the literary productions of those early sages had not only resulted from a supernal impulse, but were infallible, divine, and even eternal. These works have become the sacred Scriptures of India. And in the popular opinion, if not in the estimation of the learned, most Indian works of any importance, of a religious, scientific, or philosophical kind, which were produced at a later period, have come to be regarded as inspired, as soon as the lapse of ages had removed the writers beyond familiar or traditional knowledge, and invested their names with a halo of reverence.

To return from this digression to the inquiry which was being pursued regarding the opinions of the ancient Vedic rishis on the subject of their own inspiration:

How, it will be asked, are we to reconcile this impression which the rishis manifest of being prompted by supernatural aid, with the circumstance, which seems to be no less distinctly proved by the citations made in the preceding section (pp. 128, 136), that they frequently speak of themselves as having *made, fabricated,* or *generated* the hymns, without apparently betray-

[5] See Nägelsbach's Nachhomerische Theologie, pp. 173 ff.

ing any consciousness that in this process they were inspired or guided by any extraneous assistance?

I am not in a position to attempt any very precise explanation of this discrepancy. I will only suggest (1) that possibly the idea of inspiration may not have been held by the earliest rishis, but may have grown up among their successors; or (2) that it may have been entertained by some rishis, and not by others; or again (3), if both ideas can be traced to the same author (as is possibly the case in R. V. i. 109, 1, 4), we may suppose that the one notion was uppermost in his mind at one moment, and the other at another; or (4) that he had no very clearly defined ideas of inspiration, and might conceive that the divine assistance of which he was conscious, or which at least he implored, did not render his hymn the less truly the production of his own mind; that, in short, the superhuman and human elements were not incompatible with one another.

The first of these suppositions is, however, attended with this difficulty, that both conceptions, viz., that of independent unassisted composition, and that of inspiration, appear to be discoverable in all parts of the Rig-veda. As regards the second supposition, it might not be easy (in the uncertainty attaching to the Vedic tradition contained in the Anukramani or Vedic index) to show that such and such hymns were written by such and such rishis, rather than by any others. It may, however, become possible by continued and careful comparison of the Vedic hymns, to arrive at some probable conclusions in regard to their authorship, so far at least as to determine that particular hymns should probably be assigned to particular eras, or families, rather than to others. I must, however, leave such investigations to be worked out, and the results applied to the present subject, by more competent scholars than myself.

III.—While in many passages of the Veda, an efficacy is ascribed to the hymns, which is perhaps nothing greater than natural religion teaches all men to attribute to their devotions, in other texts a mystical, magical, or supernatural power is

represented as residing in the prayers and metres. (See Weber's Vājasaneyi-Sanhitæ specimen, p. 61.)

Thus in R. V. i. 67, 3, it is said: *Ajo na xāṁ dādhāra pṛithivīṁ tastambha dyām mantrebhiḥ satyaiḥ* | "(Agni) who like the unborn, supported the broad earth, and upheld the sky by true prayers." The following is part of Sāyana's annotation on this verse: *Mantrair divo dhāraṇaṁ Taittirīye samāmnātaṁ* | "*devā vā ādityasya svarga-lokasya parācho 'tipātād abibhayuḥ* | *taṁ chhandobhir adṛihan dhṛityā*" *iti* | *yadvā satyair mantraiḥ stūyamāno 'gnir dyāṁ tastambha iti* | "The supporting of the sky by mantras is thus recorded in the Taittirīya: 'The gods feared lest the sun and the heaven should fall down; they propped them up by metres.' Or the verse may mean that Agni, being lauded by true mantras, upheld the sky."

R. V. i. 164, 25.—*Jagatā sindhuṁ divi astabhāyad rathantare sūryam pari apaśyat* | *gāyatrasya samidhas tisra āhus tato mahnā pra ririche mahatvā* | "By the Jagatī metre he fixed the waters in the sky; he beheld the sun in the Rathantara (a portion of the Sāma-veda): there are said to be three divisions of the Gāyatrī; hence it surpasses [all others] in power and grandeur."

R. V. iii. 53, 12.—*Viśvāmitrasya raxati brahma idam Bhāratañ janam* | "The prayer of Viśvāmitra protects this tribe of the Bharatas."

R. V. v. 31, 4.—*Brahmāṇa Indram mahayanto arkair avardhayan Ahaye hantavai u* | "The priests magnifying Indra by their praises, have fortified him for slaying Agni."

R. V. v. 40, 6.— . . . *Gūḷham sūryaṁ tamasā apavratena turīyeṇa brahmaṇā avindad Atriḥ* | v. 8. . . . *Atriḥ sūryasya divi chaxur ādhāt svarbhānor apa māyā aghuxat* | v. 9. *Yaṁ vai sūryaṁ svarbhānus tamasā avidhyad āsurah* | *Atrayas tam anvavindan na hi anye aśaknuvan* | "Atri, by his fourth prayer, discovered the sun which had been concealed by an unholy darkness. 8. . . . Atri placed the eye of the sun in the sky, and hid the delusions of Svarbhānu. 9. The Atris discovered

the sun, which Svarbhānu, of the Asura race, had pierced; no other could [effect this]."

R. V. vi. 75, 19.— . . . *Devās taṁ sarve dhūrvantu brahma varma mamāntaram* | "May all the gods destroy him; the prayer is my protecting armour."

R. V. vii. 19, 11.—*Nu Indra śūra stavamānaḥ ūtī brahmajūtas tanvā vavṛidhasva ityādi* | "Heroic Indra, lauded with devotion, and impelled by our prayers, grow in body," etc.

R. V. vii. 33, 3.— . . . *Even nu kaṁ dāśarājñe Sudāsam prāvad Indro brahmaṇā vo Vasishṭhāḥ* | 5. . . . *Vasishṭhasya stuvataḥ Indraḥ aśrod uruṁ Tṛitsubhyaḥ akṛiṇod u lokam* | "Indra has delivered Sūdas in the combat of the ten kings through your prayer, Vasishtha. 5. Indra heard Vasishtha when he praised, and opened a wide place for the Tritsus."

R. V. viii. 15, 7 (= S. V. ii. 995).—*Tava tyad indriyam bṛihat tava śushmam uta kratuṁ vajraṁ śiśātī dhishaṇā vareṇyam* | "The hymn sharpens thy great strength, thy vigour, thy force, [and thy] glorious thunderbolt."

(This verse is translated by Benfey, S. V. p. 286, who, in a note, thus describes the doctrine of the hymns: "Prayer sharpens the thunderbolt, and consequently Indra's might; for the power, etc., of all the gods is derived from the sacrifices and prayers of men.")

R. V. viii. 49, 9.—*Pāhi naḥ Agne ekayā pāhi uta dvitīyayā pāhi gīrbhis tisṛibhir ūrjāmpate pāhi chatasṛibhir vaso* | "Protect us, Agni, through the first, protect us through the second, protect us, lord of power, through three hymns, protect us through four, thou gracious one."

The following passage celebrates the numbers of the metres:

R. V. x. 114, 8, 9.—*Sahasradhā pañchadaśāni ukthā yāvad dyāvā-pṛithivī tāvad it tat* | *Sahasradhā mahimānaḥ sahasraṁ yāvad brahma tāvatī vāk* | *kaś chhandasāṁ yogam āveda dhīraḥ ko dhishṇyām prati vācham papāda* | *kam ṛitvíjām ashṭamaṁ śūram āhur harī Indrasya ni chikāya kaḥ svit* | "There are a thousand times fifteen *ukthas;* that extends [they extend?] as

far as heaven and earth. A thousand times a thousand are the glorifications; speech is commensurate with devotion. What sage knows the [whole] series [or application] of the metres? Who has obtained all the forms of devotional speech? Whom do they call the eighth hero among priests? Who has perceived the two steeds of Indra?"

(The word *dhishṇya* is said by Yāska, Nirukta, viii. 3, to be = to *dhishaṇya*, and that again to be = to *dhishaṇābhava*, "springing" from *dhishaṇā*, "speech," or "sacred speech."

I conclude the series of texts relating to the power of the mantras by quoting the whole of the 130th hymn of the 10th Mandala of the R. V.: *Yo yajño viśvatas tantubhis tataḥ ekaśataṁ devakarmebhir āyataḥ | ime vayanti pitaro ye āyayuḥ pra vāya apa vaya āsate tate | 2. Pumān enam tanute utkṛiṇatti pumān vi tatne adhi nāke asmin | ime mayūkhā upa shedur ū sadaḥ sāmāni chakrus tasarāṇi otave | 3. Kā āsīt pramā pratimā kiṁ nidānam ājyam kim āsīt paridhiḥ ka āsīt | chhandaḥ kim āsīt präugaṁ kim uktham yad devā devam ayajanta viśve | 4. Agner gāyatrī abhavat sayugvā ushṇihayā Savitā sambabhūva | anushṭubhā Somaḥ ukthair mahasvān Bṛihaspater bṛihatī vācham āvat | 5. Virāṇ Mitrāvaruṇayor abhiśrīr Indrasya trishtub iha bhāgaḥ ahnaḥ | Viśvān devān jagatī āviveśa tena chākḷṛipre ṛishayo manushyāḥ | 6. Chākḷṛipre tena ṛishayo manushyā yajñe jāte pitaraḥ naḥ purāṇe | paśyan manye manasā chaxasā tān ye imaṁ yajñam ayajante pūrve | 7. Sahastomāḥ sahachhandasaḥ āvṛitaḥ sahapramāḥ ṛishayaḥ sapta daivyāḥ | pūrveshām panthām anudriśya dhīrā anvālebhire rathyo na raśmīn |* "The [web of] sacrifice which is stretched on every side with threads, which is extended with one hundred [threads], the work of the gods,—these fathers who have arrived weave it; they sit where it is extended, [saying?] 'weave forwards, weave backwards.' The Man stretches it out and spins it, the Man has extended it over this sky. These rays [rishis?] approached the place of sacrifice; they made the Sāma verses the shuttles for the woof. What was the order [of the ceremonial], what the dispo-

sition, what the service, what the offering, what the enclosure, what the metre, what the preliminary chaunt, and what the hymn, when all the gods sacrificed to the god [or, offered up the god as a victim]? The *gāyatrī* was produced as the [metre] attendant upon Agni; Savitri appeared with the *ushṇih*; and Soma, glorious through hymns (*ukthas*), with the *anushṭubh*; the *bṛihatī* preferred the voice of Bṛihaspati. The *virāṭ* attached itself to Mitra and Varuna; the *trishṭubh*, assigned to [?] the day, [accompanied] Indra. The *jagatī* entered into the Viśvedevas. By this means men were made rishis, [or rishis and men were formed]. By this means our mortal fathers were made rishis, when this ancient sacrifice was celebrated. Beholding, I know [or I believe I behold] with my mind, [as] an eye, those ancients who performed this sacrifice. The seven divine rishis, with hymns, with metres, [with] ritual forms, and with the prescribed arrangements, steadily contemplating the path of the ancients, have, like charioteers, followed after the rays."

(I shall not attempt to explain the meaning and purport of all the parts of this mystical hymn. The precise signification of some of the terms relating to the ceremonial of sacrifice in verse 3, is not supplied in any work to which I have access. In the rendering of those to which I refer, Mr. Colebrooke, who has translated the passage (Essays, i. 34, 35, or p. 18 of W. and N.'s ed.) differs from M. Langlois. My object in quoting the hymn is to show how the various metres are associated with the different deities, in this primeval and mysterious rite, and how a certain sanctity of character is thus imparted to them. The Atharva-veda (x. 7, 43, 44) gives the second verse somewhat differently from the R. V., as follows: *Pumān enad vayati udgṛiṇatti pumān enad vi jabhāra adhi nāke | ime mayūkhā upa tastabhur divañ sāmāni chakrus tasaraṇi vātave |* "The Man weaves and spins this: the Man has spread this over the sky. *These rays have propped up the sky;* they have made the Sāma verses shuttles for the woof.")

IV.—But whatever may have been the nature or the source of the supernal illumination to which the rishis laid claim, it is quite clear that some among them at least made no pretensions to anything like a perfect knowledge of all subjects, human and divine, as they occasionally confess their ignorance of matters in which they felt a deep interest and curiosity. This is shown in the following texts:

R. V. i. 164, 5.—*Pākaḥ pṛichchhāmi manasā avijānan devānām enā nihitā padāni | vatse bashkaye adhi sapta tantūn vi tatnire kavayaḥ otavai ū | 6. Achikitvān chikitasaś chid atra kavīn pṛichchhāmi vidmane na vidvān | vi yas tastambha shaḷ imā rajāṅsi ajasya rūpe kim api svid ekam | 37. Na vi jānāmi yad iva idam asmi niṇyaḥ sannaddho manasā charāmi | yadā mā āgan prathamajāḥ ṛitasya ād id vāchaḥ aśnuve bhāgam asyāḥ |* "Immature, not knowing in my mind, I enquire; these [are] the hidden or treasured truths [or abodes] of the gods; the sages have stretched out seven threads for a woof over the yearling calf [or over the sun, the abode of all things]. Not comprehending, I ask those sages who comprehend this matter; unknowing, [I ask] that I may know; what is the one thing, in the form of the uncreated, who has upheld these six worlds? 37. I do not recognize if I am like this; I go on perplexed and bound in mind. When the first-born sons of sacrifice [or truth] come to me, then I enjoy a share of that word."

(I do not attempt to explain the proper sense of these obscure and mystical verses. It is sufficient for my purpose that they clearly express ignorance on the part of the speaker. Prof. Wilson's translation of the passages may be compared. Prof. Müller, Anc. Ind. Lit., p. 567, renders verse 37 as follows:—"I know not what this is that I am like; turned inward I walk, chained in my mind. When the first-born of time comes near me, then I obtain the portion of this speech.")

R. V. x. 88, 18.—*Kati agnayaḥ kati sūryāsaḥ kati ushasaḥ kati u svid āpaḥ | na upaspṛijaṁ vaḥ pitaro vadāmi pṛichchhāmi*

vaḥ kavayo vidmane kam | "How many fires are there? how many suns? how many dawns? how many waters? I do not, fathers, say this to you in jest; I really ask you, sages, in order that I may know."

R. V. x. 129, 5.—*Tiraśchīno vitato raśmir eshām adhaḥ svid āsīd upari svid āsīt* | *retodhā āsan mahimāna āsan svadhā avastat prayatiḥ parastāt* | 6. *Kaḥ addhā veda kaḥ iha pravochat kutaḥ ājātā kutaḥ iyaṁ visṛishtiḥ* | *arvāg devā asya visarjanena athā ko veda yataḥ ābabhūva* | 7. *Iyaṁ visṛishṭir yataḥ ābabhūva yadi vā dadhe yadi vā na* | *yaḥ asya adhyaxaḥ parame vyoman sa aṅga veda yadi vā na veda* | "Their ray, obliquely extended, was it below, or was it above? There were generative sources, and there were great powers, svadhā (nature) below, and effort above. *Who knows, who hath here declared* whence this creation was produced, whence [it came]? The gods were subsequent to the creation of this universe; *who then knows* whence it sprang? Whence this creation sprang, whether it was formed or not,—He who, in the highest heavens, is the overseer of this universe,—he indeed knows, or he does not know."

(The last verse may also be rendered, "He from whom this creation sprang,—whether he made it or not,—he who is the overseer of this universe, he knows, or he does not know." See the translation of the whole hymn by Mr. Colebrooke in his Essays, i. 33, 34, or p. 17 of W. and N.'s ed. See also Prof. Müller's translation and comment in pp. 559-564 of his History of Anc. Sanskrit Lit.)

We have seen (above, p. 45) that a claim is set up (by some unknown writer quoted by Sāyana) on behalf of the Veda that it can impart an understanding of all things, past and future, subtile, proximate, and remote; and that according to Sankara Āchāryya (on the Brahma sutras, i. 1, 3) as cited above, p. 52, note, the knowledge which it manifests, approaches to omniscience. All such proud pretensions are, however, plainly enough disavowed by the rishis who uttered the complaints of ignorance

which I have just adduced. It is indeed urged by Sāyana (see above, pp. 45, 46) in answer to the objection, that passages like R. V. x. 129, 5, 6, can possess no authority as sources of knowledge, since they express doubt,—that this is not their object, but that it rather is to intimate by a figure of speech the extreme profundity of the Divine essence, and the great difficulty which any persons not well versed in the sacred writings must experience in comprehending it. There can, however, be little doubt that the authors of the passages I have cited did feel their own ignorance and intended to give utterance to this feeling. As, however, such confessions of ignorance on the part of the rishis, if admitted, would have been incompatible with the doctrine that the Veda was an infallible source of divine knowledge, it became necessary for the later theologians who held that doctrine to deny, or explain away, the plain sense of those expressions.

It should be noticed that these confessions of ignorance and fallibility are by no means inconsistent with the supposition that the rishis may have conceived themselves to be animated and directed in the composition of their hymns by a divine impulse. Though the two rivals, Vasishtha and Viśvāmitra, to enhance their own importance, and recommend themselves to their royal patrons, talk proudly about the wide range of their knowledge (see above, pp. 142-144), it is not necessary to imagine that, either in their idea or in that of the other ancient Indian sages (any more than in that of the Grecian bards), inspiration and infallibility were convertible or co-extensive terms. Both the Greek minstrel and the Indian rishi may have believed that they received, indeed, such supernatural aid as enabled them to perform what they must otherwise have left unattempted, but which after all resulted in only a partial illumination, and left them still liable to mistake and doubt.

I must also remark that this belief in their own inspiration which I imagine the rishis to have held, falls very far short of the conceptions which later writers, whether Naiyāyika, Mīmānsaka, or Vedantist, entertain in regard to the supernatural origin

and authority of the Veda. The gods from whom the rishis supposed that they derived their illumination, at least Agni, Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Soma, Pūshan, etc., would all fall under the category of *productions*, or divinities created *in time*. This is clearly shown by the comments of Śankara on the Brahma Sūtras, i. 3, 28 (above, pp. 69, 70). But if these gods were themselves *created*, and even (as we are told in the Rig-veda itself, x. 129, 6, cited in p. 178) produced *subsequently* to some other parts of the *creation*, the hymns with which they inspired the rishis, could not have been *eternal*. The only one of the deities referred to in the Rig-veda as sources of illumination, to whom this remark would perhaps not apply, is Vāch or Sarasvatī, who is identified with the supreme Brahma in the passage of the Vrihad Aranyaka Upanishad quoted above (p. 108, note 53); though this idea probably originated subsequently to the era of the hymns. But it is not to *created* gods, like Agni, Indra, and others of the same class, that the origin of the Veda is referred by the Naiyāyikas, Mīmānsakas, or Vedantists. The Naiyāyikas represent the *eternal* Īśvara as the author of the Veda; at least, this is the opinion of Udayana Acharyya, the writer of the Kusumānjali (in the passages which I shall quote in the Appendix in a note on p. 81). And the Mīmānsakas and Vedantists, as we have seen (pp. 52-73, and note 39, pp. 51, 52), either affirm that the Veda is uncreated, or derive it from the eternal Brahma. Their view, consequently (unless we admit an exception in reference to Vāch), differs from that of the Vedic rishis themselves, who do not seem to have had any idea, either of their hymns being *uncreated*, or of their being derived from the eternal Brahma.

As regards the relation of the rishis to deities like Indra, it is also deserving of notice that later mythologists represent the former, not only as quite independent of the latter, and as gifted with an inherent capacity of raising themselves by their own austerities to the enjoyment of various superhuman faculties, but even as possessing the power of rivalling the gods them-

selves, and taking possession of their thrones. See the stories of Nahusha and Viśvāmitra in the First Part of this work, particularly pp. 68, 103, and 108. Compare also the passages from the Rig-veda, x. 154, 2, and x. 167, 1, quoted above, p. 146, where the rishis are said to have attained to heaven, and Indra to have conquered it, by devotion (*tapas*).

SECT. V.—*Texts from the Upanishads, showing the opinions of the authors regarding their own inspiration, or that of their predecessors.*

I shall now adduce some passages from the different Upanishads, to show what opinions their authors entertained either in regard to their own inspiration, or that of the earlier sages, from whom they assert that their doctrine was derived by tradition.

I. Śvetāśvatara Up. v. 2 (already quoted above, p. 96).—*Yo yoniṁ yonim adhitishṭhaty eko viśvāni rūpāṇi yonīścha sarvāḳ ṛishim prasūtaṁ Kapilaṁ yas tam agre jñānair bibhartti jāyamānañcha paśyet* | "He who alone presides over every place of production, over all forms, and all sources of birth, who formerly nourished with various knowledge that rishi Kapila, who had been born, and beheld him at his birth."

II. Śvetāśvatara Up. vi. 21.—*Tapaḳ-prabhāvād veda-prasādāchcha Brahma ha Śvetāśvataro 'tha vidvān* | *atyāśramibhyaḳ paramam pavitram provācha samyag ṛishi-saṅgha-jushṭam* | "By the power of austerity, and by the grace of the Veda, the wise Svetāśvatara declared perfectly to the men in the highest of the four orders, the supreme and holy Brahma, who is sought after by the company of rishis." (Dr. Röer's translation, p. 68, follows the commentator in rendering the first words of the verse thus: "By the power of his austerity, *and the grace of God.*" This, however, is not the literal meaning of the words *veda-prasādāchcha*, a reading the correctness of which is not denied.)

III. Mundaka Up. i. 1 ff. (quoted above, p. 18, more at

length).—*Brahmā devānām prathamaḥ sambabhūva viśvasya karttā bhuvanasya goptā | Sa brahma-vidyāṁ sarva-vidyā-pratishṭhām Atharvāya jyeshṭha-putrāya prāha |* "Brahma was born the first of the gods, he who is the maker of the universe and the supporter of the world. He declared the science of Brahma, the foundation of all the sciences, to Atharva, his eldest son."

IV. Chhandogya Up. p. 625 ff.—*Tad ha etad Brahmā Prajāpataye uvācha Prajāpatir Manave Manuḥ prajābhyaḥ | āchāryya-kulād vedam adhītya yathā vidhānaṁ guroḥ karmātiśeshena abhisamāvṛitya kuṭumbe śuchau deśe svādhyāyam adhīyāno dhārmikān vidadhad ātmani sarvendriyāṇi sampratishṭhāpya ahiṁsan sarva-bhūtāni anyatra tīrthebhyaḥ sa khalv evaṁ varttayan yāvadāyusham Brahma-lokam abhisampadyate na cha punar āvarttate na cha punar āvarttate |* "This [doctrine] Brahmā declared to Prajāpati, Prajāpati declared it to Manu, and Manu to his descendants. Having received instruction in the Veda from the family of his religious teacher in the prescribed manner, and in the time which remains after performing his duty to his preceptor; and when he has ceased from this, continuing his religious studies at home, in his family, in a pure spot, communicating a knowledge of duty [to young men], withdrawing all his senses into himself, doing injury to no living creature, away from holy places [?], thus passing all his days, a man attains to the world of Brahma, and does not return again, and does not return again, [*i.e.*, is not subjected to any future births]."

I quote the commencement of Śankara's comment on this passage: *Tad ha etad ātma-jñānaṁ sopakaraṇam om ity etad axaram ityādyaiḥ saha upāsanais tadvāchakena granthena ashṭādhyāya-laxaṇena saha Brahmā Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ Parameśvaro vā taddvāreṇa Prajāpataye Kaśyapāya uvācha | asāv api Manave svaputrāya | Manuḥ prajābhyaḥ | ityevam śruty-artha-sampradāya-paramparayā āgatam upanishad-vijñānam adyāpi vidvatsv avagamyate |* "This knowledge of soul, with its instruments, with the sacred monosyllable *om* and other formulæ of

devotion, and with the book distinguished as containing eight chapters, which sets forth all these topics, [viz., the Chhāndogya Upanishad itself] was declared by Brahmā Hiranyagarbha, or by Parameśvara (the supreme God), through his agency, to the Prajāpati Kaśyapa. The latter in his turn declared it to his son Manu, and Manu to his descendants. In this manner the sacred knowledge contained in the Upanishads, having been received through successive transmission of the sense of the Veda from generation to generation, is to this day understood among learned men."

APPENDIX.

NOTE I. *on Page* 19, *Line* 2.

I ADDUCE here some further passages from Indian authors in addition to those already cited in pp. 17-19, which depreciate the ceremonial, or exoteric parts of the Vedas, in comparison with the esoteric knowledge of Brahma.

I. My attention has been drawn to the following passage of the Bhagavad Gītā, ii. 42 ff., by its quotation in an (as yet) unpublished work on Hindu Philosophy by the Rev. Professor K. M. Banerjea, of Calcutta: *Yām imām pushpitāṁ vācham pravadanty avipaśchitaḥ | veda-vāda-ratāḥ pārtha nānyad astīti vādinaḥ | kāmātmānaḥ svarga-parāḥ janma-karma-phala-pradām | kriyā-viśesha-bahulām bhogaiśvarya-gatim prati | bhogaiśvarya-prasaktānām tayā 'pahṛita-chetasām | vyavasāyātmikā buddhiḥ samādhau na vidhīyate | traiguṇya-vishayā vedā nistraiguṇyo bhavārjuna | . . . yāvān artha udapāne sarvataḥ samplutodake | tāvān sarveshu vedeshu brāhmaṇasya vijānataḥ |* "A flowery doctrine (promising future births and the reward of works, prescribing numerous ceremonies, with a view to future gratification and glory) is preached by unlearned men, devoted to the injunctions of the Veda, assertors of its exclusive importance, sensual in disposition, and seekers after paradise. The restless minds of the men who, through this [flowery doctrine], have become bereft of wisdom, and are ardent in the pursuit of future enjoyment and glory, are not applied to contemplation. The Vedas have for their objects the three qualities (*sattva*,

rajas, tamas, or 'goodness,' 'passion,' and 'darkness'); but be thou, Arjuna, free from these three qualities.... As great as is the use of a well which is surrounded on every side by overflowing waters, so great [and no greater?] is the use of the Vedas to a Brahman endowed with true knowledge."

II. Chhāndogya Up. p. 473 (Colebrooke's Essays, i. 12).— *Adhīhi bhagava iti ha upasasāda Sanatkumāraṁ Nāradaḥ | taṁ ha uvācha yad vettha tena mā upasīda tatas te ūrddhvaṁ vaxyāmi iti | sa ha uvācha ṛigvedam bhagavo 'dhyemi yajurvedaṁ sāma-vedam ātharvaṇaṁ chaturtham itihāsa-purāṇam pañchamaṁ vedānāṁ vedam pitryaṁ rāśiṁ daivaṁ nidhiṁ vākovākyam ekāyanaṁ deva-vidyām brahma-vidyām bhūta-vidyāṁ xatra-vidyāṁ naxatra-vidyāṁ sarpa-deva-jana-vidyām etad bhagavo 'dhyemi | so 'ham bhagavo mantra-vid evāsmi na ātma-vit | śrutaṁ hy eva me bhagavaddṛiśebhyas 'tarati śokam ātma-vid' iti so 'ham bhagavaḥ śochāmi tam mā bhagavān śokasya pāraṁ tārayatv iti | taṁ ha uvācha yad vai kiñcha etad adhyagīshṭhā nāma evaitat | nāma vā ṛigvedo yajur-vedaḥ sāmaveda ātharvaṇaś chaturtha itihāsa-purānaḥ pañchamo vedānāṁ vedaḥ pitryo rāśir daivo nidhir vākovākyam ekāyanaṁ deva-vidyā brahma-vidyā bhūta-vidyā xatra-vidyā naxatra-vidyā sarpa-deva-jana-vidyā nāma evaitad nāma upāsva iti | sa yo nāma brahma ity upāste yāvad nāmno gataṁ tatra asya yathā kāmachāro bhavati yo nāma brahma ity upāste | asti bhagavo nāmno bhūya iti | nāmno vāva bhūyo 'sti iti | tan me bhagavān bravītv iti |* "Nārada approached Sanatkumāra, saying, 'Instruct me, venerable sage.' He received for answer, 'Approach me with [*i.e.*, tell me] that which thou knowest; and I will declare to thee whatever more is to be learnt.' Nārada replied, 'I am instructed, venerable sage, in the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Ātharvana, [which is] the fourth, the Itihāsas and Puranas, [which are] the fifth Veda of the Vedas, the rites of the pitris, arithmetic, the knowledge of portents, and of great periods, the art of reasoning, ethics, interpretation, the knowledge of Scripture, demonology, the science of war, the

knowledge of the stars, the sciences of serpents and deities; this is what I have studied. I, venerable man, *know only the hymns* (*mantras*); while I am ignorant of soul. But I have heard from reverend sages like yourself that "the man who is acquainted with soul overpasses grief." Now I, venerable man, am afflicted; but do thou conduct me across my grief.' Sanatkumāra answered, 'That which thou hast studied is nothing but *name*. The Rig-veda is *name;* and so are the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Ātharvana, the fourth, and the Itihāsas and Puranas, the fifth Veda of the Vedas, etc. [all the other branches of knowledge are here enumerated just as above],—all these are but name: worship the name. He who worships a name with the persuasion that it is Brahma, holds as it were a dominion at his will over all which that name comprehends;—such is the prerogative of him who worships name with the persuasion that it is Brahma.' 'Is there anything, venerable man,' asked Nārada, 'which is more than name?' 'There is,' he replied, 'something more than name?' 'Tell it to me,' rejoined Nārada."

(Śankara interprets the words *pañchamaṁ vedānāṁ vedam* differently from what I have done. He separates the words *vedānāṁ vedam* from *pañchamam* and makes them to mean *the means of knowing the Vedas, i.e.*, grammar. See above, p. 107.)

III. Bṛihadāraṇyaka Up. iv. 3, 22 (p. 792 ff., p. 228-9 of Dr. Röer's English).—*Atra pitā apitā bhavati mātā amātā lokā alokā devā adevā vedā avedāḥ | atra steno 'steno bhavati bhrūṇahā abhrūṇa-hā chāṇḍālo 'chāṇḍālaḥ paulkaso 'paulkasaḥ śramaṇo 'sramaṇas tāpaso 'tāpaso nanvāgatam puṇyena ananvāgatam pāpena tīrṇo hi tadā sarvān śokān hṛidayasya bhavati |* "In that [condition of transcendental knowledge] a father is no father, a mother is no mother, the worlds are no worlds, the gods are no gods, and the Vedas are no Vedas. In that condition a thief is no thief, a murderer of embryos is no murderer of embryos, a Chāndāla no Chāndāla, a Paulkasa no Paulkasa, a Śramana no Śramana, a devotee no devotee; the saint has

then no relation either to merit or sin; for he then crosses over all griefs of the heart."

(I quote Śankara's explanation of the unusual words *nanvāgata* and *ananvāgata: Nanvāgataṁ na anvāgatam ananvāgatam asambaddham ity etat puṇyena śāstra-vihitena karmaṇā tathā pāpena vihitākaraṇa-pratishiddha-kriyā-laxaṇena* | "*Nanvāgata, i.e., na* (not) *anvāgata,* or *ananvāgata, i.e., asambaddha.* This condition is unconnected either with merit, *i.e.,* action enjoined by the śāstra, or with sin, *i.e.,* action distinguished as the neglect of what is enjoined, or the doing of what is forbidden.")

IV. To the same effect the great sage Nārada is made to speak in the Bhāgavata Pur. iv. 29, 42 ff.: *Prajāpati-patiḥ sāxād bhagavān Giriśo Manuḥ* | *Daxādayaḥ prajādhyaxā naishṭhikāḥ Sanakādayaḥ* | *Marīchir Atryaṅgirasau Pulastyaḥ Pulahaḥ Kratuḥ* | *Bhṛigur Vasishṭha ity ete mad-antā brahma-vādinaḥ* | *adyāpi vāchaspatayas tapo-vidyā-samādhibhiḥ* | *paśyanto 'py na paśyanti paśyantam Parameśvaram* | *śabda-brahmaṇi dushpāre charanta uruvistare* | *mantra-liṅgair vyavachchhinnam bhajanto na viduḥ param* | *yadā yasyānugṛihṇāti bhagavān ātma-bhāvitaḥ* | *sa jahāti matiṁ loke vede cha parinishṭhitām* | *tasmāt karmasu varhishmann ajñānād artha-kāśishu* | *mā 'rtha-dṛishṭiṁ kṛithāḥ śrotra-sparśishv aspṛishta-vastushu* | *sva-lokaṁ na vidus te vai yatra devo Janārdanaḥ* | *āhur dhūmra-dhiyo vedaṁ sakarmakam atad-vidaḥ* | *āstīrya darbhaiḥ prāg-agraiḥ kārtsnyena xiti-maṇḍalam* | *stabdho vṛihad-vadhād mānī karma nāvaishi yat param* | *tat karma Hari-toshaṁ yat sā vidyā tan-matir yayā* | "Brahmā himself, the divine Giriśa (Śiva), Manu, Daxa and the other Prajāpatis, Sanaka and other devotees, Marīchi, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Bhṛigu, Vasishtha—all these assertors of Brahma (as the sole essence), and masters of speech, including myself (Nārada) as the last, though seeing, are yet, to this day, unable, by austerity, by science, by contemplation, to see Parameśvara (the supreme God), who sees all things. Wandering in the vast field of the verbal Divinity (the Veda), which is difficult to traverse, men do

not recognise the supreme, while they worship him as he is circumscribed by the attributes specified in the hymns (mantras). When the Divine Being regards any man with favour, that man, sunk in the contemplation of soul, abandons all thoughts which are set upon the world and the Veda. Cease, therefore, Varhishmat, through ignorance, to look upon works which merely *seem* to promote the chief good, as if they truly effected that object, (works) which only touch the ear, but do not touch the reality. The misty-minded men, who, ignorant of the Veda, declare that works are its object, do not know [his?] own world, where the divine Janārdana abides. Thou who, obstinate man that thou art, strewest the whole earth with sacrificial grass, with its ends turned to the east, and art proud of thy numerous immolations, thou knowest not what is the highest work of all. That by which Hari (Vishnu) is pleased, is work; that by which the thoughts are fixed on him, is science."

I copy the comment on a part of this passage, viz., on verses 45 and 46 : *Śabda-brahmaṇi vede urur vistāro yasya arthato 'py pāra-śūnye tasmin varttamānā mantrāṇāṁ liṇgair vajra-hastatvādi-guṇa-yukta-vividha-devatā-'bhidhāna-sāmarthyaiḥ parichchhinnam eva Indrādi-rūpam tat-tat-karmāgraheṇa bhajantaḥ param Parameśvaraṁ na viduḥ ‖ Tarhy anyaḥ ko nāma | karmādy-āgrahaṁ hitvā parameśvaram eva bhajed ity ata āha 'yadā yam anugṛihṇāti' | anugrahe hetuḥ | ātmani bhāvitaḥ san sa tadā loke loka-vyavahāre vede cha karma-mārge parinishṭhitām matiṁ tyajati* | "Men, conversant with the verbal Divinity, the Veda, of which the extent is vast, and which, as regards its meaning also, is shoreless, worshipping Parameśvara [the supreme God] under the form of Indra, etc., and circumscribed by the marks specified in the hymns, *i.e.*, circumscribed by various particular energies denominated deities, who are characterised by such attributes as 'wielder of the thunderbolt,' etc.; worshipping Him, I say, thus, with an addiction to particular rites, men do not know the supreme God. What other [god], then, [is there]? He therefore says, in the words, 'When he

regards any one with favour,' etc., let a man, abandoning all addiction to works, etc., worship the supreme God alone. The reason for this favour [is supplied in the following words]: 'Sunk in the contemplation of soul, he then relinquishes his regard directed to the business of the world and to the Veda, *i.e.*, to the method of works.'"

Note II. *on Page* 22, *Line* 14.

Mahīdhara on the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā (Weber's ed. p. 1) says, in regard to the division of the Vedas: *Tatrādau Brahma-paramparayā prāptaṁ Vedaṁ Vedavyāso manda-matīn manushyān vichintya tat-kṛipayā chaturdhā vyasya Ṛig-yajuḥ-sāmātharvākhyāṁś chaturo vedān Paila-Vaiśampāyana-Jaimini-Sumantubhyaḥ kramād upadideśa te cha sva-śishyebhyaḥ | Evam paramparayā sahasra-śākho Vedo jātaḥ |* "Vedavyasa, having regard to men of dull understanding, in kindness to them, divided into four parts the Veda which had been originally handed down by tradition from Brahmā, and taught the four Vedas, called Rik, Sāman, Yajush, and Atharvan, in order, to Paila, Vaisampāyana, Jaimini, and Sumantu; and they again to their disciples. In this way, by tradition, the Veda of a thousand śākhās was produced."

Note III. *on Page* 65, 4*th Line from the bottom.*

The following extract from the account of the Pūrva-mīmānsā philosophy, given in the Sarva-darśana-sangraha of Mādhava Achāryya (Bibliotheca Indica, pp. 127 ff.), contains a fuller summary of the controversy between the Mīmānsakas and the Naiyāyikas respecting the grounds on which the authority of the Veda should be regarded as resting, than is supplied in any of the passages which I have quoted in the body of the work. As I have not studied the works of Śabara, Kumārila, Prabhākara, or the other commentators on the Mīmānsā aphorisms, I am unable to say how far this ingenious and interesting

summary is borrowed from those authors. It is probably taken from them in great part, but the special references made, in the course of the discussion, to Udayana Acharyya, Vāgīśvara, and the author of the Nyāya-bhūshaṇa, and the answers made to their objections, rather favour the supposition that the arguments urged by the author of the summary are in part original.

Syād etat | vedasya katham apaurusheyatvam abhidhīyate | tat-pratipādaka-pramāṇābhāvāt katham manyethāḥ apaurusheyā vedāḥ | sampradāyāvichchhede saty asmaryyamāṇa-karttṛikatvād ātma-vad iti | tad etad mandaṁ viśeshaṇāsiddheḥ | paurusheya-veda-vādibhiḥ pralaye sampradāya-vichchhedasya kaxīkaraṇāt | kiñcha kim idam asmaryyamāṇa-karttṛikatvaṁ nāma | apratīyamāna-karttṛikatvam asmaraṇa-gochara-karttṛikatvaṁ vā | na prathamaḥ kalpaḥ Parameśvarasya karttuḥ pramiter abhyupagamāt | na dvitīyo vikalpāsahatvāt | tathā hi | kim ekena asmaraṇam abhipreyate sarvair vā | na ādyaḥ | 'yo dharma-śīlo jitamāna-roshaḥ' ityādishu muktakoktishu vyabhichārāt | na dvitīyaḥ | sarvāsmaraṇasya asarvajña-durjñānatvāt |

Paurusheyatve pramāṇa-sambhavāchcha veda-vākyāni paurusheyāni | vākyatvāt | Kālidāsādi-vakya-vat | veda-vākyāni āpta-praṇītāni | pramāṇatve sati vākyatvād Manv-ādi-vākya-vad iti |

Nanu | 'Vedasyādhyayanaṁ sarvaṁ gurv-adhyayana-pūrvakam | vedādhyayana-sāmānyād adhunā 'dhyayanaṁ yathā' | ity anumānam prati sādhanam pragalbhate iti chet | tad api na pramāṇa-koṭim praveshṭum īshṭe | 'Bhāratādhyayanaṁ sarvaṁ gurv-adhyayana-pūrvakam | Bhāratādhyayanatvena sāmpratā-'dhyayanaṁ yathā' iti ābhāsa-samāna-yoga-xematvāt | nanu tatra Vyāsaḥ karttā iti smaryyate 'ko hy anyaḥ Puṇḍarīkāxād Mahābhārata-kṛid bhavet' ity ādāv iti chet | tad asāram | 'ṛichaḥ sāmāni jajñire | chhandāṁsi jajñire tasmād yajus tasmād ajāyata' iti purusha-sūkte vedasya sakartṛikatā-pratipādanāt |

Kiñcha anityaḥ śabdaḥ sāmānyavattve sati asmad-adi-vāhyendriya-grāhyatvād ghaṭa-vat | nanv idam anumānaṁ sa evāyaṁ ga-kāra ity pratyabhijñā-pramāṇa-pratihatam iti chet | tad ati

phalgu 'lūna-punarjāta-keśa-dalita-kund'-ādāv iva pratyabhijñāyā sāmānya-vishayatvena bādhakatvābhavāt |

Nanv aśarīrasya Parameśvarasya tālv-ādi-sthānābhāvena varṇochchāraṇāsambhavāt kathaṁ tat-praṇītatvaṁ vedasya syād iti chet | na tad bhadraṁ svabhāvato 'śarīrasyāpi tasya bhaktānugrahārthaṁ līlā-vigraha-grahaṇa-sambhavāt | tasmād vedasya apaurusheyatva-vācho yuktir na yuktā iti chet |

Tatra samādhānam abhidhīyate | Kim idam paurusheyatvaṁ sisādhayishitam | purushād utpannatva-mātram | yathā asmad-ādibhir ahar ahar uchchāryyamāṇasya vedasya | pramāṇāntareṇa artham upalabhya tat-prakāśanāya rachitatvaṁ vā | yathā asmad-ādibhir eva nibadhyamānasya prabandhasya | prathame na vipratipattiḥ | charame kim anumāna-balāt tat-sādhanam āgama-balād vā | na ādyaḥ | Mālatī-mādhavādi-vākyeshu savyabhichāratvāt | atha pramāṇatve sati iti viśishyate iti chet | tad api na vipaśchito manasi vaiśadyam āpadyate | pramāṇāntarāgocharārtha-pratipādakaṁ hi vākyaṁ Veda-vākyam | tat pramāṇāntara-gocharārtha-pratipādakam iti sādhyamāne 'mama mātā bandhyā' iti vad vyāghātāpātāt | kiñcha Parameśvarasya līlā-vigraha-parigrahābhyupagame 'py atīndriyārtha-darśanaṁ na saṁjāghatīti deśa-kāla-svabhāva-viprakṛishṭārtha-grahaṇopāyābhāvāt | na cha tachchaxur-ādikam eva tādṛik-pratīti-jananaxamam iti mantavyam | dṛishṭānusāreṇaiva kalpanāyā āśrayaṇīyatvāt | tad uktaṁ Gurubhiḥ sarvajña-nirākaraṇa-velāyām 'yatrāpy atiśayo dṛishṭaḥ sa svārthānatilaṅghanāt | dūra-sūxmādidṛishṭau syād na rūpe śrotra-vṛittitā' iti | ata eva na āgama-balāt tat-sādhanam |

'Tena proktam' iti Pāṇiny-anuśāsane jāgraty api kāṭhaka-kālāpa-taittirīyam ityādi-samākhyā adhyayana-sampradāya-pravarttaka-vishayatvena upapadyate | tad-vad atrāpi sampradāya-pravarttaka-vishayatvenāpy upapadyate | na cha anumāna-balāt śabdasya anityatva-siddhiḥ | pratyabhijñā-virodhāt | na cha asaty apy ekatve sāmānya-nibandhanam tad iti sāmpratam | sāmānya-nibandhanatvam asya balavad-bādhakopanipātād āsthīyate kvachid vyabhichāra-darśanād vā | tatra kvachid vyabhi-

chāra-darśane tad-utprexāyām uktaṁ svataḥ-prāmāṇya-vādibhiḥ | 'utprexeta hi yo mohād ajñātam api bādhanam | sa sarva-vyavahāreshu saṁśayātmā vinaśyati' iti |

Nanv idam pratyabhijñānaṁ gatvādi-jāti-vishayaṁ na gādi-vyakti-vishayaṁ tāsāṁ prati-purusham bhedopalambhād | anyathā 'Somaśarmā 'dhīte' iti vibhāgo na syād iti chet | tad api śobhāṁ na bibhartti gādi-vyakti-bhede pramāṇābhāvena gatvādi-jāti-vishaya-kalpanāyām pramāṇābhavāt | Yathā gatvam ajānata ekam eva bhinna-deśa-parimāṇa-saṁsthāna-vyakty-upadhāna-vaśād bhinna-deśam iva alpam iva mahad iva dīrgham iva vāmanam iva prathate tathā ga-vyaktim ajānata ekā 'pi vyañjaka-bhedāt tat-tad-dharmānubandhinī pratibhāsate | etena viruddha-dharmādhyāsād bheda-pratibhāsa iti pratyuktam | tatra kiṁ svābhāviko viruddha-dharmādhyāso bheda-sādhakatvena abhimataḥ prātītiko vā | prathame asiddhiḥ | aparathā svābhāvika-bhedābhyupagame daśa ga-kārān udachārayat Chaitra iti prattipattiḥ syād na tu daśakṛitvo ga-kāra iti | dvitīye tu na svābhāvika-bheda-siddhiḥ na hi paropādhi-bhedena svābhāvikam aikyaṁ vihanyate | mā bhūd nabhaso 'pi kumbhādy-upādhi-bhedāt svābhāviko bhedas tatra vyāvṛita-vyavahāro nādanidānaḥ | tad uktam āchāryyaiḥ | 'prayojanantu yaj jātes tad varṇād eva labhyate | vyakti-labhyantu nādebhya iti gatvādi-dhīr vṛithā' iti | tathā cha 'pratyabhijñā yadā śabde jāgartti niravagrahā | anityatvānumānāni saiva sarvāṇi bādhate' | Etena idam apāstaṁ yad avādi Vāgīśvareṇa Mānamanohare 'anityaḥ śabdaḥ indriya-viśesha-guṇatvāt chaxū-rūpa-vad' iti | śabda-dravyātva-vādināṁ pratyaxa-siddheḥ dhvanyaṁśe siddha-sādhanatvāchcha | aśrāvaṇatvopādhi-bādhitatvāchcha | Udayanas tu āśrayāpratyaxatve 'py abhāvasya pratyaxatām mahatā prabandhena pratipādayan nivṛittaḥ kolāhalaḥ utpannaḥ śabdaḥ iti vyavahārāchāraṇe kāraṇam pratyaxaṁ śabdānityatve pramāṇayati sma | so'pi viruddha-dharma-saṁsargasya aupādhikatvopapādana-nyāyena datta-rakta-balinā iva tālaḥ samāpohi | nityatve sarvadopalabdhy-anupalabdhi-prasaṇgo yo Nyāyabhūshaṇa-kāroktaḥ so 'pi dhvani-saṁskṛitasya upalambhābhyupagamāt pratixiptaḥ | yat tu

yugapad indriya-sambandhitvena pratiniyata-saṁskāraka-saṁskāryya-bhāvānumānaṁ tad ātmany anaikāntikam asati kalakale | tataścha vedasya apaurusheyatayā nirasta-samasta-śaṅkā-kalaṅkāṅkuratvena svataḥ siddhaṁ dharme prāmāṇyam iti susthitam |

Syād etat | 'pramāṇatvāpramāṇatve svataḥ Sāṅkhyaḥ samāśritāḥ | Naiyāyikās te parataḥ Saugatāś charamaṁ svataḥ | prathamam parataḥ prāhuḥ prāmāṇyaṁ veda-vādinaḥ | pramāṇatvaṁ svataḥ prāhuḥ parataścāpramāṇatām' | iti vādi-vivāda-darśanāt kathaṁkāraṁ svataḥ siddhaṁ dharma-prāmāṇyam iti siddhavatkṛitya svīkriyate | kiñcha kim idaṁ svataḥ prāmāṇyaṁ nāma | kiṁ svata eva prāmāṇyasya janma | āhosvit svāśraya-jñāna-janyatvaṁ kim uta svāśraya-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatvam utāho jñāna-sāmagrī-janya-jñāna-viśeshāśritatvaṁ kiṁva jñāna-sāmagrī-mātra-janya-jñāna-viśeshāśritatvam | tatra ādyaḥ sāvadyaḥ | kāryya-kāraṇa-bhāvasya bheda-samānādhikaraṇatvena ekasminn asambhavāt | nāpi dvitīyaḥ | guṇasya sato jñānasya prāmāṇyam prati samavāyi-kāraṇatayā dravyatvāpātāt | nāpi tṛitīyaḥ prāmāṇyasya upādhitve jātitve vā janmāyogāt | smṛititvānadhikaraṇasya jñānasya bādhātyantābhāvaḥ prāmāṇyopādhiḥ | na cha tasya utpatti-sambhavaḥ atyantābhāvasya nityatvābhyupagamāt | ata eva na jāter api janir yujyate | nāpi chaturthaḥ | jñāna-viśesho hy apramā | viśesha-sāmagryāñcha sāmanya-sāmagrī anupraviśati | śiṁśapā-sāmagryām iva vṛixa-sāmagrī | aparathā tasya ākasmikatvam prasajet | tasmāt paratastvena svīkṛitāprāmāṇyaṁ vijñāna-sāmagrī-janyāśritam ity ativyāptir āpadyeta | pañchama-vikalpaṁ vikalpayāmaḥ | kiṁ doshābhāva-sahakṛita-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatvam eva jñāna-sāmagrī-mātra-janyatvam kiṁ doshābhāvāsahakṛita-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatvam | na ādyaḥ | doshābhāva-sahakṛita-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatvam eva parataḥ prāmāṇyam iti parataḥ prāmāṇya-vādibhir ururīkaraṇāt | nāpi dvitīyaḥ | doshābhāva-sahakṛitatvena sāmagryāṁ sahakṛitatve siddhe ananyathā-siddhānvaya-vyatireka-siddhatayā doshābhāvasya kāraṇatāyā vajra-lepāyamānatvāt | abhāvaḥ kāraṇam eva na bhavati iti chet tadā vaktavyam abhāvasya kāryyatvam asti na vā | yadi nāsti tadā paṭa-pradhvaṁsānupapattyᵖ

nityatā-prasaṇgaḥ | atha asti kim aparāddhaṁ kāraṇatvena iti sā ubhayataḥ-pāśā rajjuḥ | tad uditam Udayanena 'bhāvo yathā tathā 'bhāvaḥ kāraṇāṁ kāryya-vad mataḥ' iti | tathā cha prayogaḥ | vimatā pramā jñāna-hetv-atirikta-hetv-adhīnā kāryatve sati tad-viśeshatvāt apramā-vat | prāmāṇyam parato jñāyate anabhyāsa-daśāyām sāṁśayikatvāt aprāmāṇya-vat | tasmād utpattau jñaptau cha paratastve pramāṇa-sambhavāt svataḥ siddham prāmāṇyam ity etat pūti-kushmāṇḍāyate iti chet | tad etad ākāśa-mushṭi-hananāyate | vijñāna-sāmagrī-janyatve sati tad-atirikta-hetv-ajanyatvam pramāyāḥ svatastvam iti nirukti-sambhavāt | asti cha atra anumānam | vimatā pramā vijñāna-sāmagrī-janyatve sati tad-atirikta-janyā na bhavati | apramātvānadhikaraṇatvāt ghaṭādi-vat | na cha audayanam anumānam paratastva-sādhakam iti śaṇkanīyam | pramā doshavyatirikta-jñāna-hetv-atirikta-janyā na bhavati | jñānatvād apramāvad | iti pratisādhana-graha-grastatvāt | jñāna-sāmagrī-mātrād eva pramotpatti-sambhave tad-atiriktasya guṇasya doshābhāvasya vā kāraṇatva-kalpanāyām kalpanā-gaurava-prasaṇgāchcha | nanu doshasya apramā-hetutvena tad-abhāvasya pramām prati hetutvaṁ durnivāram iti chet | na doshābhāvasya apramā-pratibandhakatvena anyathā [a?] siddhatvāt | 'tasmād guṇebhyo doshāṇām abhāvas tad-abhāvataḥ | aprāmāṇya-dvayāsattvaṁ tenotsargo nayoditaḥ' iti | tathā pramā-jñaptir api jñāna-jñāpaka-sāmagrīta eva jāyate | na cha saṁśayānudaya-prasaṇgo bādhaka iti yuktaṁ vaktum | saty api pratibhāsa-pushkalakāraṇe pratibandhaka-doshādi-samavadhānāt tad-upapatteḥ | kiñcha tāvakam anumānam svataḥ-pramāṇaṁ na vā | ādye anaikāntikatā | dvitīye tasyāpi parataḥ prāmāṇyam evaṁ tasya tasyāpi ity anavasthā duravasthā syāt | yad atra Kusumāñjalāv Udayanena jhaṭiti prachura-pravṛitteḥ prāmāṇya-niśchayādhīnatvābhāvam āpadayatā praṇyagādi pravṛittir hi ichchhām apexate tat-prāchuryye cha ichchhā-prāchuryyam ichchhā cheshṭasādhanatā-jñānaṁ tachcha ishṭa-jātīyatva-liṇgānubhavaṁ so 'pi indriyārtha-sannikarsham prāmāṇya-grahaṇantu na kvachid upayujyate iti tad api taskarasya purastāt kaxe suvarṇam

upetya sarvāngodghāṭanam iva pratibhāti | ataḥ samīhita-sādhana-jñānam eva pramāṇatayā avagamyamānam ichchhāṁ janayati ity atraiva sphuṭa eva prāmāṇya-grahaṇasya upayogaḥ | kiñcha kvachid api ched nirvichikitsā pravṛittiḥ saṁsayād upapadyeta tarhi sarvatra tathā-bhāva-sambhavāt prāmāṇya-niśchayo nirarthakaḥ syāt aniśchitasya sattvam eva durlabham iti prāmāṇyaṁ datta-jalāñjalikam bhavet ity alam ati-prapañchena | yasmād uktam 'tasmād sad-bodhakatvena prāptā buddheḥ pramāṇata | arthānyathātva-hetūttha-dosha-jñānād apodyate' iti | tasmād dharme svataḥ-siddha-pramāṇa-bhāve 'jyotishṭomena svarga-kāmo yajeta' ityādi-vidhy-arthavāda-mantra-nāmadheyātmake vede yajeta ity atra ta-pratyayaḥ prakṛityarthoparaktām bhāvanām abhidhatte iti siddhe vyutpattim abhyupagachchhatām abhihitānvaya-vādinām Bhaṭṭāchāryyānāṁ siddhānto yāga-vishayo niyoga iti kārye vyutpattim anusaratām anvitābhidhāna-vādinām Prabhākara-gurūṇāṁ siddhānta iti sarvam avadātam |

"Be it so. But how [the Naiyāyikas may ask] is the Veda alleged to be underived from any personal author? How can you regard the Vedas as being thus underived, when there is no evidence by which this character can be substantiated? The argument urged by you Mīmānsakas is, that while there is an unbroken tradition, still no author of the Veda is remembered, in the same way as [none is remembered] in the case of the soul (or self). But this argument is very weak, because the asserted characteristic [unbrokenness of tradition] is not proved; since those who maintain the personal origin [*i.e.*, origin from a person] of the Veda, object that the tradition [regarding the Veda] *was* interrupted at the dissolution of the universe (*pralaya*).[1] And further: what is meant by the assertion that no author of the Veda is remembered? Is it (1) that no author is believed? or (2) that no author is the object of recollection? The *first* alternative cannot be accepted, since it is acknowledged [by us] that God (*Parameśvara*) is proved to be the author. Nor

[1] This objection occurs in a passage of the *Kusumāñjali*, which I shall quote further on.

can the *second* alternative be admitted, as it cannot stand the test of the following dilemma, viz., Is it meant (*a*) that no author of the Veda is recollected by some *one* person, or (*b*) by *any person whatever?* The *former* supposition breaks down, since it fails when tried by such stanzas as this, 'he who is religious, and has overcome pride and anger,' etc.[2] And the *latter* supposition is inadmissible, since it would be impossible for any person who was not omniscient to know that no author of the Veda was recollected by *any person whatever*.

"And moreover, [the Naiyāyikas proceed], the sentences of the Veda must have originated with a personal author, as proof exists that they had such an origin, since they have the character of sentences, like those of Kālidasa and other writers. The sentences of the Veda have been composed by an authoritative person, since, while they possess authority, they have, at the same time, the character of sentences, like those of Manu and other sages.

"But [ask the Mīmānsakas] may it not be assumed that, 'All study of the Veda was preceded by an earlier study of it by the pupil's preceptor, since the study of the Veda must always have had one common character, which was the same in former times as now;'[3] and that this inference has force to prove [? that the Veda had no author or was eternal]? Such reasoning [the Naiyāyikas answer] is of no avail as proof, [for it might be said in the same way that] 'All study of the *Mahābhārata* was preceded by an earlier study of it by the pupil's preceptor, since the study of the Mahābhārata, from the mere fact of its being such, [must have had the same character in former times]

[2] I do not know from what work this verse is quoted, or what is its sequel. To prove anything in point, it must apparently go on to assert that such a saint as is here described, *remembers the author of the Veda*, or at least has such superhuman faculties as would enable him to discover the author.

[3] The purport of this verse is, that as every generation of *students* of the Veda must have been preceded by an earlier generation of *teachers*, and as there is no reason to assume any variation in this process by supposing that there ever had been any student who taught himself; we have thus a *recessus ad infinitum*, and must of necessity conclude that the Vedas had no author, but were eternal.

as it has now;' and this mere *semblance* of an argument would be of the same value in either case. But [the Mīmānsakas will ask whether there is not a difference between these two cases of the Veda and the Mahābhārata, since] the *smṛiti* declares that [Vishnu incarnate as] Vyāsa was the author of the latter,—according to such texts as this, 'Who else than Puṇḍarīkāxa (*the lotus-eyed Vishnu*) could be the maker of the Mahābhārata?' (see above, p. 21),—[whilst nothing of this sort is recorded in any Śāstra in regard to the Veda]. This argument, however, is powerless, since it is proved by these words of the Purusha-sūkta, 'From him sprang the *ṛik* and *sāma* verses and the metres, and from him the *yajush* verses,' (above, p. 50) that the Veda *had* a maker.

"Further, [proceed the Naiyāyikas], we must suppose that sound [on the eternity of which the eternity and uncreatedness of the Veda depend] is not eternal, since, while it belongs to a genus, it can, like a jar, be perceived by the external organs of beings such as ourselves. But [rejoin the Mīmānsakas], is not this inference of yours refuted by the proof arising from the fact that we recognize the letter G, for example, as the same we have heard before? This argument, [replies the Naiyāyika], is extremely weak, for the recognition in question having reference to a community of species (as in the case of such words as 'a jasmine tree with sprouted tendrils [?] cut and grown again,' etc.) has no force to refute my assertion [that letters are not eternal].

"But, [asks the Mīmānsaka], how can the Vedas have been composed by the incorporeal Parameśvara (God), who has no palate or other organs of speech, and therefore cannot enunciate letters? This objection, [answers the Naiyāyika], is worthless, because, though Parameśvara is naturally incorporeal, he can yet, by way of sport, assume a body, in order to shew kindness to his devoted worshippers. Consequently, the arguments in favour of the doctrine that the Veda had no personal author are inconclusive."

"I shall now, [says the Mīmānsaka], clear up all these difficulties. What is meant by this *paurusheyatva* ('derivation from a personal author') which it is sought to prove? Is it (1) mere *procession* (*utpannatva*) *from a person* (*purusha*), like the procession of the Veda from persons such as ourselves, when we daily utter it? or (2) is it the *arrangement, with a view to its manifestation,—of knowledge acquired through other channels of information,* in the sense in which persons like ourselves compose a treatise? If the *first* meaning be intended, there will be no dispute. If the *second* sense be meant, I ask whether the Veda is proved [to be authoritative] in virtue (*a*) of its being founded on *inference,* or (*b*) of its being founded on *supernatural information?* The *former* alternative (*a*) [*i.e.*, that the Veda derives its authority from being founded on inference] cannot be correct, since this theory breaks down, if it be applied to the sentences of the Mālatī Mādhava or any other secular poem, [which may contain inferences destitute of authority]. If, on the other hand, you say (*b*), that the contents of the Veda are distinguished from those of other books by having authority, this explanation also will fail to satisfy a philosopher. For the word of the Veda is [defined to be] a word which proves things that are not proveable by any other evidence. Now if it could be established that this vedic word did nothing more than prove things that *are* proveable by other evidence, we should be involved in the same sort of contradiction as if a man were to say that *his mother was a barren woman.* And even if we conceded that Parameśvara might in sport assume a body, it would not be conceivable that [in that case] he should perceive things beyond the reach of the senses, from the want of any means of apprehending objects removed from him in place, in time, and in nature. Nor is it to be thought that his eyes and other senses alone would have the power of producing such knowledge, since men can only attain to conceptions corresponding with what they have perceived. This is what has been said by the Guru (Prabhākara) when he refutes [the supposition of] an omniscient

person: 'Whenever any object is perceived [by the organ of sight] in its most perfect exercise, such perception can only have reference to the *vision* of something very *distant* or very *minute*, since no organ can go beyond its *own* proper objects, as *e.g.*, the ear can never become cognizant of form.' Hence the authority of the Veda does not arise in virtue of any supernatural information [acquired by the Deity in a corporeal shape, and embodied in the sacred text].

"In spite of the weight attaching [?][4] to the rule of Pānini (see above, p. 87) that the grammatical affix with which the words Kāthaka, Kālāpa, and Taittirīya are formed, imparts to those derivatives the sense of 'uttered by' Katha, Kalāpa, etc., it is established that the names first mentioned have reference [*not* to those parts of the Veda being 'uttered' by the sages in question, but] to the fact that these sages instituted the practice of *studying* those parts of the Veda. Here also these appellations ought to be understood in the same manner, as referring to the fact of those sages being the institutors of the study of the Veda; and we are not to think that the eternity of sound [or of the words of the Veda] is disproved by the force of any inference [to be drawn from those names], since this would be at variance with the recognition [of letters as the same we knew before] (see above, Mīmānsa Sūtra, i. 13, p. 56). Nor, even though [numerical] unity were not [predicable of each particular letter] (see Mīmānsa Sūtra, i. 20, above p. 58), is it proper to insist that each letter is a term expressive of a species. The supposition that it is a generic term is opposed [?] by the intervention of powerful contrary arguments; or by our perceiving that sometimes this character would fail to be applicable. In respect to those who, while they observe that [a definition] is inapplicable in some cases, yet disregard this circumstance, the following remark has been made by those [the Mīmānsakas, etc.] who maintain the self-

[4] Literally, *although the rule of Pāṇini be awake.* The sense given in the text is the only one I can think of.

proving power [of the Veda]: 'The man who through bewilderment disregards even an unknown refutation, being in all matters full of doubt, perishes.'

"But [the Naiyāyikas will ask], does not the recognition [of G and other letters as the same we knew before] refer to them as belonging to the [same] *species*, and not as being the [same] *individual* letters, since, in fact, they are perceived to be different [as uttered by] each person, and since otherwise it would be impossible for us to make any distinction [between different readers, as when we say], 'Somaśarman is reading?' This objection, however, has as little brilliancy as its predecessors, and has been answered in this way, viz., that as there is no proof of any distinction of *individuality* between G's, etc., there is no evidence that we ought to suppose any such thing as a *species* of G's, etc. [*i.e.*, of G's and other letters each constituting a species]. Just as to the man who is ignorant that G's constitute a species, [that letter], though one only, becomes (through distinction of place, magnitude, form [?], individuals, and position [?]) variously modified as distinct in place, as small, as great, as long, or as short, in the same way, to the man who is ignorant of an *individuality* of G's, [*i.e.*, of G's being numerically different from each other], this letter, though only one, appears, from the distinction existing between the different persons who utter it, to be connected with their respective peculiarities; and as contrary characters are in this way erroneously ascribed [to the letter G], there is a fallacious appearance of distinctness [between different G's]. But does this ascription of contrary characters which we thus regard as creating a difference [between G's], result from (1) the *nature of the thing*, or (2) from *mere appearance?* There is no proof of the *first* alternative, as otherwise an inherent difference being admitted between different G's, it would be established that Chaitra had uttered ten [different] G's, and not [the same] G ten times. But on the *second* supposition, there is no proof of any inherent distinction [between G's]; for inherent oneness (or

identity) is not destroyed by a difference of extrinsic disguises [or characteristics]. We must not conceive, from the merely apparent distinctness [occasioned by the separation of its parts] by jars, etc., that there is any inherent distinctness in the atmosphere itself. The fact is that when the action of sound is intercepted [by the atmosphere], it ceases to be audible.[5] It has been said by the Āchāryya, 'The object which the Naiyāyikas seek, by supposing a *species*, is in fact gained from the letter itself; and the object at which they aim by supposing an *individuality* in letters, is attained from audible *sounds* (*i.e.*, the separate *utterances* of the different letters), so that the hypothesis of species, etc., is useless.' And we thus reach the conclusion that, 'since, in respect of sounds (letters), recognition has so irresistible a power, [literally, *wakes, unrestrained*], it alone repels all inferences against the eternity [of sound, or the Veda].

This refutes what has been said by Vāgīśvara in the Mānamanohara, that 'sound is not eternal, because it is the quality of a particular organ, as form is of the eye;' for it is to those who declare sound to be a substance, [and to them only?] that the perception [of sound in this manner] is established, while as regards audible sound, the assertion of this perceptibility is merely a proving of what is admitted; and because this theory of sound being the quality of a particular sense is disproved by the characteristic of not making itself [always?] audible.

[5] I am by no means sure that this sentence is correctly rendered, but have no preferable translation to suggest. I owe the reader some apology for the imperfect and tentative character of my version in many parts of the remainder of this extract. But having begun the translation, I was naturally anxious to carry it on as far as I could. As this part of the Sarva-darśana-sangraha has not before been rendered into any European language, and we possess as yet no work which explains completely all the technical terms of Indian logic and philosophy, I am unfortunately in an opposite predicament to that on which Kālidāsa congratulated himself at the commencement of his task of celebrating the race of the Raghus, when he was able to say that he could enter upon his subject, which had been previously handled by earlier poets, with the same ease, as a thread penetrates into a gem which has been perforated by a diamond" (*maṇau vajra-samutkīrṇe sūtrasyevasti me gatiḥ*). The reader must just take this part of my translation for so much as he finds it to be worth. But I think that, though I may have erred in details, I have not mistaken the general scope.

And Udayana—maintaining by a long dissertation that, though the substratum be not perceptible by sense, still the non-existence [of sound] is perceptible, and [observing it to be] a customary occurrence that when noise ceases, sound is produced—alleges that perception, which is the cause of that phenomenon, is a proof of the non-eternity of sound. He also is refuted by showing the merely adventitious character of the [effect produced on letters by the] influence of opposite qualities [in the speakers], just as a sacrificial knife is only stained *superficially* by a bloody oblation. And, again, the difficulty which has been raised to the eternity of sound by the author of the Nyāya-bhūshaṇa, on the ground that it is not observed to be constantly perceived,—this difficulty also is removed by the admitted fact that sound which has been articulated in utterance is perceived. Once more, the inference which is drawn in reference to there being a fixed relation between the articulator and the [sound] to be articulated, from sound having reference to the organs [of many persons?] at one and the same time, this is inconclusive in itself[?], there being no confused noise. And hence, as every stain of doubt which has come to light has been set aside by the underived character of the Veda, its authority as proof in matters of duty is clearly established.

"Be it so. But [verse] 'the Sānkhyas say that both authoritativeness and non-authoritativeness are self-derived; the Naiyāyikas maintain that both are dependent on something external; the Bauddhas assert that non-authoritativeness is self-derived, while authoritativeness depends on something extraneous to itself; and the upholders of the Veda declare that authoritativeness is self-derived, and the absence of it dependent on something external.' Now, when we observe the differences between the assertors of these several views, how can it be admitted as a settled point that there is such a thing as self-proved authority for duty? And what is this self-proved authority? What is its source (*lit.* birth)? Does it spring (1) from self-dependent knowledge? or (2) from the constituents (or totality) of self-dependent know-

ledge? or (3) does it depend on some special knowledge springing from the constituents (or totality) of knowledge? or (4) does it depend on some special knowledge springing from the *mere* constituents (or totality) of knowledge? The *first* supposition is faulty, from the fact that cause and effect, which are categorically distinct, cannot properly be placed in the same class, or predicated of the same subject. The *second* supposition is no better, owing to the objection that, whereas knowledge is a *quality*, the character of a *substance* is here ascribed to its self-evidencing authority, since the function of a material cause is assigned to it. Nor can the *third* supposition be allowed, for as self-evidencing power is either an *attribute* (*upādhi*) or a *species*, production (*i.e.*, the being produced) does not apply to it. The condition of authoritativeness is the absolute absence of any defect in knowledge which has not recollection [?] for its basis. Now such authoritativeness cannot possibly be *produced*, as it is admitted that absolute non-existence is *eternal;* and consequently the production of *species* also is inadmissible. The *fourth* supposition is equally faulty, for special knowledge is something unauthoritative, and the constituents of the general [or genus] enter into the constituents of the special, as the substance of a tree in general enters into the substance of the [particular] tree, the *śinśapa* (*sisu*). Otherwise we should be involved in the absurdity that it had no cause. Hence that which depends on what is produced from the constituents of knowledge is confessedly unauthoritative, from its dependence on something external, and thus your definition will fail by embracing too much (*ativyāpti*).

"We shall now (interposes the Mīmānsaka) propose a *fifth* supposition. What do you mean by 'springing from the mere constituents, [or simple totality] of knowledge?' Does it mean (1) 'the springing from the constituents of a knowledge which is accompanied by the absence of defects (*i.e.*, which is faultless?),' or (2) 'the springing from the constituents of a knowledge which is *un*accompanied by the absence of defects

(*i.e.*, which is faulty)?' It cannot be the *first*, for 'a springing from the constituents of knowledge which is accompanied by the absence of defects [*i.e.*, which is faultless] is simply authoritativeness *derived from something external*, as is allowed by those who maintain that authoritativeness is derived from something external. Nor can it be the *second*, for the character of *accompaniedness* being substantiated in regard to any object, by the circumstance of its being *accompanied* by the absence of defects,[6] . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

If you object that *non-existence* [as in this case of the *non-existence* of defects] cannot be a *cause*, then you must tell us whether it (non-existence) is an *effect* or not. If it be not, then from the [consequent] impossibility [of any substance], a piece of cloth [for instance], being destroyed, we are entangled in the absurdity of supposing that it must be eternal. But if non-existence be an *effect*, what error is there in asserting its *causality* also? thus this rope binds [you] at both ends. And Udayana says (Kusumānjali, i. 10), 'Just as existence, so also non-existence is regarded as a cause, as well as an effect.'

And now we shall apply this: variously-understood truth (*pramā*) is (our opponents say) dependent on a cause distinct from the cause of knowledge, from the fact of its being a production, and as such, possessing the particular character of a production, just as is the case with error [or the absence of truth, *apramā*]. And authoritativeness is regarded as being derived from something external, owing to the doubtfulness [of the student?] before he has made the matter a subject of repeated study, just as is the case with unauthoritativeness. But to describe as *self-proved* authoritativeness that which, in its origin and in its [earliest] comprehension, thus derives its proof from an *external source*, is (they say) to make an asser-

[6] I am unable to make out the meaning of the remainder of this sentence, and must therefore leave it untranslated.

tion which is utterly worthless.[7] But this objection of theirs is as vain as beating the air with their fists. [Such a thing as] a production from the constituents of knowledge [being admitted], it is in not being produced from any cause distinct from *that*, that the self-derivation of truth [or knowledge] consists. This results from the explanation of the term itself. And here we have also an inference [to rely upon]. There being [such a thing as] a production from the constituents of knowledge, variously-understood truth [or knowledge] does not spring from anything distinct from this, since it has not erroneousness as its basis, as jars, etc., [have no unhomogeneous material as their basis (?)]. Nor is it to be surmised that Udayana's inference proves [authoritativeness to have] an external source. Correct knowledge does not, like error, spring from anything distinct from the cause of a knowledge which is devoid of defects, because it is knowledge, so that [Udayana's objection] is carried away by the demon of adverse proof [?]. And since it appears that authoritativeness springs from the simple constituents of knowledge, if you suppose that any quality distinct from *that*, or that the absence of defect, is the cause [of authoritativeness], you will incur the charge of making more suppositions than are necessary to explain the facts. If it be objected to this, that since *defect* is the cause of *unauthoritativeness*, it cannot be denied that the *absence of defect* must be the cause of *authoritativeness*, we deny this, since the absence of defect (or faultlessness) is, on other grounds, not proved[8] to be that which prevents unauthoritativeness."

I shall not attempt to carry farther my translation of this abstruse discussion, as the remainder contains several parts which I should find it difficulty to render. The real proof or disproof of the authority of the Veda must rest on grounds very

[7] I do not know the proper meaning of the word *pūti-kushmāṇḍāyate*. *Pūti* means either "purification" or "stench;" and *kushmāṇḍāyate* is a nominal verb formed from *kushmāṇḍa*, a "gourd." The compound may therefore mean "it is like a gourd full of filth."

[8] I take the *anyathāsiddhatvāt*, which I find in the Calcutta text, to be for (*anyathā asiddhatvāt*).

much less abstract and metaphysical than such as are here argued with so much subtlety.

The following passage from Śankara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, iii. 2, 40, is partly quoted in Prof. Banerjea's forthcoming work on Hindu Philosophy. In the two preceding Sūtras, as explained by Śankara, it had been asserted, both on grounds of reason and on the authority of the Veda, that God is the author of rewards. In the 40th Sūtra a different doctrine is ascribed to Jaimini: *Dharmaṁ Jaiminir ata eva || Jaiminis tv āchāryyo dharmam phalasya dātāram manyate | ata eva hetoḥ śruter upapatteścha | śrūyate tāvad ayam arthaḥ 'svarga-kāmo yajeta' ity evam ādishu vākyeshu | tatra cha vidhi-śruter vishaya-bhāvopagamād yāgaḥ svargasya utpādakaḥ iti gamyate | anyathā hy ananushṭhātṛiko yāga āpadyeta tatra asya upadeśasya vaiyarthyaṁ syāt | nanv anuxaṇa-vināśinaḥ karmaṇaḥ phalaṁ na upapadyate iti parityakto 'yam paxaḥ | na esha doshaḥ śruti-prāmāṇyāt | śrutiś chet pramāṇaṁ yathā 'yaṁ karma-phala-sambandhaḥ śrutaḥ upapadyate tathā kalpayitavyaḥ | na cha anutpādya kimapy apūrvaṁ karma vinaśyat kālāntaritam phalaṁ dātuṁ śaknoti ity ataḥ karmaṇo vā sūxmā kāchid uttarā-vasthā phalasya vā pūrvāvasthā apūrvaṁ nāma asti iti tarkyate | upapadyate cha ayam arthaḥ uktena prakāreṇa | Īśvarastu phalaṁ dadāti ity anupapannam avichitrasya kāraṇasya vichitra-kāryyānupapatteḥ | vaishamya-nairghṛiṇya-prasaṇgād anushṭhāna-vaiyarthyāpatteś cha | tasmād dharmād eva phalam iti |* "'Jaimini says that for this reason virtue [is the giver of reward].' The Āchāryya Jaimini regards virtue [*i.e.*, the performance of the prescribed rites and duties] as the bestower of reward. 'For this reason,' and because it is proved by the Veda. This is the purport of the Vedic text, 'Let the man who seeks paradise, sacrifice,' and others of the same kind. As here, we learn the existence of the object [referred to] in the Vedic injunction in question, it is concluded that sacrifice has the effect of producing heaven; for otherwise we should be involved in the absurdity of a sacrifice without a performer [since no one

would care to sacrifice without an object?], and thus the injunction would become fruitless. But may it not be said that it is not conceivable that any fruit should result from a ceremony which perishes every moment, so that this view must be abandoned? No, this defect does not attach to our Mīmānsaka statement, since the Veda is authoritative. If the Veda be proof, this connection of the reward with the ceremony must be supposed to exist just as it is proved in the Veda. And from the fact that a ceremony which perishes without generating any unseen virtue, can yet produce a reward at a distant time, it must not be concluded that there is either a certain subtile ulterior form of the ceremony, or a certain subtile anterior form of the reward, which is called 'unseen virtue.' And this result is established in the manner before mentioned. But it is not proved that God bestows rewards, because it is inconceivable that a uniform cause should produce various effects, and because the performance of ceremonies would be useless, owing to the inequality and unmercifulness which would attach [to the supposed arbiter of men's deserts]. Hence it is from virtue that reward results."

How far this passage may be sufficient to prove the atheism of the Mīmānsa, I will not attempt to say. Before we could decide on such a question, the Sūtras of that school which refer to this question (if there be any such) would have to be consulted.

Professor Banerjea also quotes the following text from the popular work, the Vidvan-modataranginī, in which the Mīmānsakas are distinctly charged with atheism: *Devo na kaśchid bhuvanasya karttā bharttā na harttā 'pi cha kaśchid āste | karmānurūpāṇi śubhāśubhāni prāpnoti sarvo hi janaḥ phalāni || vedasya karttā na cha kaśchid āste nityā hi śabdāḥ rachanā hi nityā | prāmāṇyam asmin svata eva siddham anādisiddheḥ parataḥ kathaṁ tat* | "There is no God, maker of the world; nor has it any sustainer or destroyer; for every man obtains a recompense in conformity with his works. Neither is there any maker of the Veda, for its words are

eternal, and their arrangement is eternal. Its authoritativeness is self-demonstrated, for since this authoritativeness has been established from eternity, how can it be dependent upon anything beyond itself?"

I am informed by Prof. Banerjea that the Mīmānsaka commentator Prabhākara and his school make out the Pūrva Mīmānsa to be an atheistic system, while Kumārila treats it as theistic. The last named author makes the following complaint at the commencement of his Vārttika, verse 10: *Prāyeṇaiva hi mīmāṁsā loke lokāyatīkṛitā | tām āstika-pathe karttum ayaṁ yatnaḥ kṛito mayā |* "For in practice the Mīmānsa has been for the most part converted into a Lokāyata (atheistic) system (see Colebrooke's Essays, i. 402 ff., or pp. 259 ff. of W. and N.'s ed.); but I have made this effort to bring it into a theistic path." See also the lines which are quoted from the Padma Purana by Vijnāna Bhixu, commentator on the Sānkhya aphorisms, in a passage which I shall adduce further on, in a note on p. 103.

Note IV. *on Page* 80, *Line* 18.

The Tarka-sangraha[9] says: *Vākyaṁ dvividhaṁ vaidikaṁ laukikañcha | vaidikam Īśvaroktatvāt sarvam eva pramāṇam | laukikantu āptoktam pramāṇam anyad apramāṇam |* "Sentences are of two kinds, Vedic and secular. Vedic sentences, from being uttered by Īśvara, are all proof [or authoritative]. Of secular sentences, those only which are uttered by a competent [or wise] person (*āpta*) are proof; the rest are not proof."

In this text, the authority of the Veda is founded on its being uttered by Īśvara; and this characteristic is regarded as limited to the Veda. On the other hand, such secular works as proceed from a competent person (*āpta*) are also declared to possess authority. Here, therefore, a distinction appears to be drawn between the authority of the Veda and that of all other writings,

[9] See p. 40 of Dr. Ballantyne's ed. with Hindī and English Versions, p. 40 of the Sanskrit.

however authoritative, inasmuch as the former was uttered by Īśvara, while the latter have only been uttered by some competent person (*āpta*). But in the Nyāya aphorism, ii. 68, quoted in p. 80, the authority of the Veda itself is made to rest on the authority of the wise, or competent person (*āpta*), from whom it proceeded. In the aphorism, therefore, either the word *āpta* must mean *Īśvara*, or we must suppose a difference of view between the author of the aphorism and the writer of the Tarka-sangraha. We shall see in the next note that the author of the Kusumānjali coincides with the Tarka-sangraha.

If the author of the Nyāya Sūtras did not believe in an Īśvara (see the conclusion of the next note), he could not of course derive the Veda from such a source. Prof. Banerjea, in his forthcoming work on Hindu Philosophy, quotes the following definition of the word *āpta* from Vātsāyana: *Āptaḥ khalu sākāt-kṛita-dharmā | yathā-dṛishṭasya arthasya chikhyāpayishayā prayuktaḥ upadeshṭā | sākāt-karaṇam arthasya āptis | tayā varttate ity āptaḥ |* "A competent person (*āpta*) means one who has an intuitive perception of duty (the word *sākāt-kṛita-dharman* is used in the Nirukta, i. 20; see Part Second, pp. 174 and 176; and p. 95, note 48, above),—an instructor possessed by the desire of communicating some subject-matter, just as it was seen by him. This intuitive perception constitutes competence (*āpti*). A person who has this competence is competent." *Āpta* would thus be equivalent to rishi, and could not refer to Īśvara.

The following words are put by the author of the Vishnu Purana (iii. ch. 18; Wilson, p. 340) into the mouth of the deluder who promulgated the Bauddha and other heresies: *Na hy āpta-vādā nabhaso nipatanti mahāsurāḥ | yuktimad vachanañ grāhyam mayā 'nyaiścha bhavadvidhaiḥ |* "Words of the competent do not, great Asuras, fall from the sky. It is only words supported by reasons that should be admitted by me and others like yourselves."

Note V. *on Page* 81, *Line* 13.

I extract from the Kusumānjali of Udayana Āchārya, and its commentary (published at the Sanskrit Press, Calcutta, in the Śaka year, 1769), some fuller statements of the Naiyāyika doctrine regarding the origin and authority of the Veda. Mr. Colebrooke (Ess. i. 263, or p. 166 of W. and N.'s ed.) speaks of this treatise as being accompanied by a commentary of Nārāyana Tīrtha; but the one which is printed in the Calcutta edition, is said to be by Haridāsa Bhattāchārya. The object of the work appears to be to prove the existence of a personal god (Īśvara), in opposition to various other antagonistic theories.

I. Kusumāñjali, 2nd Stavaka, at the commencement: *Anyathā 'pi paraloka-sādhanānushṭhāna-sambhavād iti dvitīya-vipratipattiḥ | Anyathā Īśvaraṁ vinā 'pi paraloka-sādhanaṁ yāgādy-anushṭhānaṁ sambhavati yāgādeḥ svarga-sādhanatvasya vedagamyatvāt | nitya-nirdoshatayā cha vedasya prāmāṇyam | mahājana-parigrahāchcha prāmāṇyasya graha iti veda-kāraṇatayā na Īśvara-siddhiḥ | yogardhi-sampādita-sārvajñya-kapilādi-pūrvaka eva vā vedo 'stu ity atra āha | "pramāyāḥ paratantratvāt sarga-pralaya-sambhavāt | tad-anyasminn aviśvāsād na vidhāntara-sambhavaḥ" | Śābdī pramā vaktṛi-yathārtha-vakyārtha-dhīrūpa-guṇa-janyā iti guṇādhāratayā Īśvara-siddhiḥ | nanu sakartṛike 'stu yathārtha-vākyārtha-dhīr guṇaḥ | akartṛike cha vede nirdoshatvam eva prāmāṇya-prayojakam astu | mahājana-parigraheṇa cha prāmāṇya-graha ity ata āha | "sarga-pralaya-sambhavād" iti pralayottaram pūrva-veda-nāśād uttara-vedasya katham prāmāṇyam mahājana-parigrahasyāpi tadā abhāvāt | śabdasya anityatvam utpanno ga-kāra iti pratīti-siddham | pravāhāvichchheda-rūpa-nityatvam api pralaya-sambhavād nāsti iti bhāvaḥ | Kapilādaya eva pūrva[?]-sargādau pūrva-sargābhyasta-yogajanya-dharmānubhavāt sāxāt-kṛita-sakalārthāḥ karttāraḥ santu | ity ata āha | "tad-anyasminn" iti | viśva-nirmāṇa-samarthā aṇimādi-śakti-sampannā yadi sarvajñās tadā lāghavād eka eva tādṛiśaḥ svīkriyatām | sa eva bhagavān Īśvaraḥ | anityāsarva-*

vishayaka-jñānavati cha viśvāsa eva nāsti | iti vaidika-vyavahāra-vilopaḥ iti na vidhāntara-sambhavaḥ Īśvarānaṅgīkartṛi-naye iti śeshaḥ |

"The second objection is that [there is no proof of an Īśvara], since the means of attaining paradise can be practised independently of any such Being. That is to say, the celebration of sacrifices, etc., which are the instruments of obtaining paradise, can take place otherwise, *i.e.*, even without an Īśvara (God). For the fact that sacrifices, etc., are the instruments of obtaining paradise is to be learned from the Veda, while the authority of the Veda rests upon its eternal faultlessness; and the [immemorial] admission of that authority results from its reception by illustrious men. Now, as in this way the Veda is the cause [of final liberation], there is no proof of a God. Or let it be supposed that the Veda was preceded [composed] by Kapila and other sages, who by their wealth in devotion had acquired omniscience.

"In answer to this, the author says: [verse] 'Since truth, [or authoritativeness] depends on an external source (see the passage from the Sarva-darśana-sangraha, above, p. 203), since creation and dissolution are probable, and since there is no confidence in any other than God, therefore no other manner can be conceived [in which the Veda originated, except from God (?)].' [Comment] Scriptural truth [or authoritativeness] is derived from the attribute, possessed by its promulgator, of comprehending the true sense of words [*i.e.*, in order to constitute the Veda an authoritative rule of duty, it must have proceeded from an intelligent being who understood the sense of what he uttered, and not, as some maintain (see above, pp. 83, 104, 105), from a being who unconsciously breathed it out]; and since God is the substratum of this attribute [of intelligence], there is proof of his existence.

"But it may be said, that this comprehension of the true sense of what is uttered may be a quality belonging to a created being; and, again, it may be the faultlessness of the uncreated

Veda, which imparts to it its authority, while the [immemorial] admission of that authority results from its reception by illustrious men.

"In answer to this, the author says: 'Since creation and dissolution are probable.' Since the previous Veda (the one which existed during the former mundane period) perished after the dissolution of the universe, how can the subsequent Veda [*i.e.*, the one supposed by our opponents to have existed during the dissolution] be authoritative, since there was not then even any reception of it by illustrious men [who also had all become extinct at the dissolution]. That is to say, the non-eternity of sound is proved by the conviction we have that letters such as G are *produced*, [and not eternal]; and even that eternity (or perpetuity) of the Veda which consists in unbroken continuity of tradition, does not exist, as there is probable proof of a dissolution.[10] But, again, some one will say that Kapila and other saints—who, from their perception of duty, springing from the practice of devotion during the former mundane period, had acquired an intuitive knowledge of every subject—may at the creation have been the authors of the Veda. This is answered in the words, 'since there is no confidence in any other but God.' If persons capable of creating the universe and possessing the faculty of minuteness be omniscient, then, for the sake of simplicity, let one such person only be admitted, namely, the divine Īśvara. And no confidence can be reposed in any person who is not eternal, or who is not possessed of a knowledge which extends to all objects. Thus the Vedic tradition [?] disappears. And so he concludes that no other manner [of the origination of the Veda?] can be conceived [except from Īśvara?]; that is, in the system of those who deny an Īśvara [no hypothesis

[10] The Mīmānsakas, or at least the Vedantists, seem to reply to this Naiyāyika objection about the interruption of the tradition of the Veda through the dissolution of the universe, by saying that the Veda was retained in the memory of Brahmā during the interval whilst the dissolution lasted. See Kullūka on Manu, i. 23, above, p. 5; and S'ankara on the Brahma Sūtras, i. 3, 29, above, pp. 68 and 72; and compare the passages from the Mahābhāshya, etc., in the concluding note of this Appendix.

can be framed which will account for the production of the Veda?]."

II. Kusumānjali, iii. 16.—*Na pramāṇam anāptoktir nādṛishṭe kvachid āptatā | adṛiśya-dṛishṭau sarvajño na cha nityāgamaḥ xamaḥ | ayaṁ hi sarva-kartṛitvābhāvāvedakaḥ śabdaḥ anāptoktaś ched na pramāṇam | āptoktaś ched etad-artha-gochara-jñānavato nitya-sarva-vishayaka-jñānavattvam indriyādy-abhāvāt | āgamasya cha nityatvaṁ dūshitam eva prāg iti veda-kāro nityaḥ sarvajñaḥ siddhyati* | [Verse] "The word of an incompetent person is not authoritative; nor can there be any competency in regard to a thing unseen. To perceive invisible things, a person must be omniscient; and an eternal scripture is impossible. [Comment] This [supposed] scriptural testimony, denying the fact of any creation whatever, if uttered by an incompetent person, would be no proof. If it was uttered by a competent person, then the person who possessed an acquaintance with this circumstance [universal non-creation] would be master of a knowledge which was eternal, and universal in its range, from his not being limited by any bodily organs. And we have previously disproved the eternity of any scripture (see the first extract from the Kusumānjali, above). Consequently an omniscient and eternal author of the Veda is established."

III. Kusumānjali, v. 1.—*Kāryyāyojana-dhṛityādeḥ padāt pratyayataḥ śruteḥ | vākyāt saṅkhyā-viśeshāchcha sādhyo visva-vid avyayaḥ | . . . Pratyayataḥ prāmāṇyāt | veda-janya-jñānāṁ kāraṇa-guṇa-janyam pramātvāt | pratyaxādi-pramā-vat | śruter vedāt | vedaḥ paurusheyo vedatvād āyurveda-vat | kiñcha vedaḥ paurusheyo vākyatvād bhāratādi-vat | veda-vākyāni paurusheyāṇi vākyatvād asmad-ādi-vākya-vat* | [Verse] "An omniscient and indestructible Being is to be proved from [the existence of] effects, from the junction of [atoms], from the support [of the earth in the sky], from action, from belief [in revelation], from the Veda, from sentences, and from particular numbers."

The following is so much of the comment as refers to the words *pratyaya, śruti,* and *vākya:* "From belief, *i.e.,* from authorita-

tiveness. The knowledge derived from the Veda is derived from the attributes of its Cause; since it is true knowledge, like the true knowledge derived from perception. From the śruti, *i.e.*, the Veda. The Veda is [shewn to be] derived from a person, by its having the characters of a Veda, like the Ayur-veda. It is also [shewn to be] derived from a person, by having the character of sentences, like the Mahābhārata. The words of the Veda are [shewn to be] derived from a person, by their having the character of sentences, like the sentences of persons such as ourselves."

IV. Kusumānjali, v. 16.—'*Syām*' '*abhūvam*' '*bhavishyāmī*' '*ityādau saṇkhyā pravaktṛi-gā | samākhyā 'pi cha śākhānāñ nādya-pravachanād ṛite | Vaidikottama-purusheṇa svatantroch-chārayituḥ saṇkhyā vāchyā | 'sa aixata eko 'ham bahu syām' ityādi bahulam uttama-purusha śruteḥ | saṇkhyā-padārtham anyam āha 'samākhyā' ityādi | sarvāsāñ śākhānañ hi Kāṭhaka-Kālāpakādyāḥ saṇkhyāḥ sāṇkhyā-viśeshāḥ śrūyante | te cha na adhyayana-mātra-nibandhanāḥ | adhyetṛīṇām ānantyāt | anādāv anyair api tad-adhyayanāt | tasmād atīndriyārtha-darśī bhagavān eva Īśvaraḥ kāruṇikaḥ sargādāv asmad-ādy-adṛishṭākṛishta [ḥ ?][11] kāṭhakādi-śarīra-viśesham adhishṭhāya yāñ yāñ śākhām uktavāñs tasyāḥ śākhāyās tannāmnā vyapadeśa iti siddham Īśvara-mananam moxa-hetuḥ* | [Verse] "The phrases 'let me be,' 'I was,' 'I shall be,' [which occur in the Veda] have reference to a speaker; and the designations of the *śākhās* could only have been derived from a primeval utterance. [Comment] The first person (I), when it occurs in the Veda, must be employed to denote the words of a self-dependent utterer. Now there are many instances there of such a use of the first person, as in the words, 'He reflected, I am one, let me become many.' The author then specifies another signification of the term 'word,' or 'name,' (*saṇkhyā*) in the clause, 'and the designations,' etc. For all

[11] I have translated as if there had been a *visarga* at the end of this word, though there is none in the Calcutta text. If the *visarga* be not allowed, we must translate, "the bodies of Katha, etc., which were drawn by the destiny," etc.

the *śākhās* bear in the Veda the names, the special names, of Kāthaka, Kālāpaka, etc. And these names cannot be connected with the mere study [of these *śākhās* by Katha, Kalāpa, etc.] from the infinite multitude of students, since if the Veda had no beginning, it must have been studied by others besides the persons just mentioned. Wherefore the particular śākhās which Īśvara, the seer of objects beyond the reach of the senses, the compassionate Lord himself uttered,—when at the beginning of the creation, drawn on by the destiny (*adrishṭa*) of beings like ourselves, he assumed the bodies of Katha, etc.,—these śākhās, I say, were designated by the names of the particular sages [in whose persons they were promulgated]. And so it is proved that the contemplation of Īśvara is the cause of final liberation."

I am unable to say if the ancient doctrine of the Nyāya was theistic, like that of the Kusumānjali, the Tarka-sangraha,[12] and the Siddhānta Muktāvali (p. 6 of Dr. Ballantyne's ed., or p. 12 of his "Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy," and p. 3 of Dr. Röer's Bhāshā-parichchheda, in Bibl. Ind.) The remarks of Dr. Röer on the subject, in pp. xv., xvi., of the introduction to the last named work, may be consulted. The subject is also discussed by Prof. Banerjea in his forthcoming work on Hindu philosophy. The solution of the question will depend much on the interpretation to be given to the aphorisms of Gotama, 19-21 of the fourth book.

Note VI. *on Page* 89, *Line* 12.

I find that the phrase *kālātyayāpadishṭa*, which here (and in p. 91, line 21) I have rendered "refuted by the length of time," is a technical term in the Nyāya philosophy, denoting one of the *hetv-ābhāsas*, or "mere semblances of reasons," and is thus

[12] *Jñānādhikaraṇam ātmā | sa dvividho jīvātmā paramātmā cha | tatra Iśvaraḥ sarvajñaḥ paramātmā eka eva | jīvātmā prati śarīram bhinno vibhur nityaścha |* "The substratum of knowledge is soul. It is of two kinds, the embodied soul, and the supreme soul. Of these the supreme soul is the omniscient Īśvara, one only. The embodied soul is distinct in each body, all-pervading, and eternal."

defined in the Nyāya Sūtras, i. 49: *Kālātyayāpadishṭaḥ kālātītaḥ* | which Dr. Ballantyne (Aph. of the Nyāya, p. 42) thus explains: "That [semblance of a reason] is Mistimed, which is adduced when the time is not [that when it might have availed]."

"[For example, suppose one argues that] fire does not contain heat, because it is factitious, [his argument is mistimed, if we have already ascertained, by the superior evidence of the senses, that fire does contain heat]."

Part of the comment of Viśvanātha on this sūtra is as follows: *Atīta-kālasya samānārthakatvāt kālātīta-śabdena uktaṁ kālasya sādhana-kālasya atyaye abhāve apadishṭaḥ prayukto hetuḥ* | *etena sādhyābhāva-pramā-laxaṇārtha iti sūchitam* | *sādhyābhāva-nirṇaye sādhanāsambhavād ayam eva bādhita-sādhyaka iti gīyate* |

Note VII. *on Page* 90, *Line* 19.

See also the passage from the Vṛihad Aranyaka Upanishad (Bibl. Ind. pp. 215, 216), quoted in Part Second, pp. 376, 377, note 4.

Note VIII. *on Page* 103, *Line* 9.

I find that Vijnāna Bhixu, the commentator on the Sānkhya aphorisms, takes very nearly the same view as is here quoted from Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, in regard to the superiority of the Brahma Mīmānsā or Vedanta over the other Darśanas.

In his Sānkhya-pravachana-bhāshya (Bibliotheca Indica, pp. 3 ff.), he thus writes: *Syād etat* | *Nyāya-vaisekikābhyām atra avirodho bhavatu* | *brahma-mīmāṁsā-yogābhyāṁ tu virodho 'sty eva* | *tābhyāṁ nityeśvara-sādhanāt* | *atra cha Īśvarasya pratishidhyamānatvāt* | *na cha atrāpi vyāvahārika-pāramārthika-bhedena seśvara-nirīśvara-vādayor avirodho 'stu seśvara-vādasya upāsanā-paratva-sambhavād iti vāchyam* | *vinigamakābhāvāt* | *īśvaro hi durjñeya iti nirīśvaratvam api loka-vyavahāra-siddham aiśvaryya-vairāgyāya anuvaditaṁ śakyate ātmanaḥ saguṇatvam iva* | *na tu kvāpi śrutyādāv īśvaraḥ sphuṭam pratishidhyate yena*

seśvara-vādasyaiva vyāvahārikatvam avadhāryeta iti | atra uchyate | atrāpi vyāvahārika-pāramārthika-bhāvo bhavati | 'asatyam apratishṭhaṁ te jagad āhur anīśvaram' | ityādi-śāstrair nirīśvara-vādasya ninditatvāt | asminn eva śāstre vyāvahārikasyaiva pratishedhasya aiśvaryya-vairāgyādy-artham anuvādatvauchityāt | yadi hi laukāyatika-matānusāreṇa nityaiśvaryyaṁ na pratishidhyeta tadā paripūrṇa-nitya-nirdoshaiśvaryya-darśanena tatra chittāveśato vivekābhyāsa-pratibandhaḥ syād iti sāṇkhyāchāryyānām āśayaḥ | seśvara-vādasya na kvāpi nindādikam asti yena upāsanādi-paratayā tat śāstraṁ saṇkochyeta | yat tu 'nāsti sāṇkhya-samaṁ jñānaṁ nāsti yoga-samam balam | atra vaḥ saṁśayo mā bhūj jñānaṁ sāṇkhyam paraṁ smṛitam' ityādi vākyam tad-vivekāṁśe eva sāṇkhya-jñānasya darśanāntarebhya utkarsham pratipādayati na tv īśvara-pratishedāṁśe 'pi | tathā Parāśarādy-akhila-śishṭa-saṁvādād api seśvara-vādasyaiva pāramārthikatvam avadhāryate | api cha 'Axapāda-praṇīte cha kāṇāde sāṇkhya-yogayoḥ | tyājyaḥ śruti-virudho 'ṁśaḥ śrutyekaśaraṇair nṛibhiḥ | Jaiminīye cha Vaiyāse virudhāṁśo na kaśchana | śrutyā vedārtha-vijñāne śruti-pāraṁ gatau hi tau' | iti Parāśaropapurāṇādibhyo 'pi brahma-mīmāṁsāyā īśvarāṁśe balavattvam | yathā | 'nyāya-tantrāṇy anekāni tais tair uktāni vādibhiḥ | hetv-āgama-sadāchārair yad yuktaṁ tad upāsyatām' | iti moxa-dharma-vākyād api Parāśarādy-akhila-śishṭa-vyavahāreṇa brahma-mīmāṁsā-nyāya-vaiśeshikādy-ukta īśvara-sādhaka-nyāya eva grāhyo balavattvāt | tathā | 'Yaṁ na paśyanti yogīndrāḥ sāṇkhyā api maheśvaram | anādi-nidhanam brahma tam eva śaraṇaṁ vraja' | ityādi-kaurmādi-vākyaiḥ sāṇkhyānām īśvarājñānasyaiva nārāyaṇādinā proktatvāchcha | kiñcha brahma-mīmāṁsāyā īśvaraḥ eva mukhyo vishayaḥ upakramādibhir avadhṛitaḥ | tatrāṁśe tasya bādhe śāstrasyaiva aprāmāṇyaṁ syāt | 'yat-paraḥ śabdaḥ sa śabdārthaḥ' iti nyāyāt | sāṇkhya-śāstrasya tu purushārtha-tat-sādhana-prakṛiti-purusha-vivekāv eva mukhyo vishayaḥ | iti īśvara-pratishedhaṁśa-bādhe 'pi na aprāmāṇyam | 'Yat-paraḥ śabdaḥ sa śabdārthaḥ' iti nyāyāt | ataḥ sāvakāśatayā sāṇkhyam eva īśvara-pratishedhāṁśe durbalam

iti | na cha brahma-mīmāṁsāyām api īśvāra eva mukhyo vishayo na tu nityaiśvaryam iti vaktuṁ śakyate | 'smṛity-anavakāśa-dosha-prasaṇga'-rūpa-pūrva-paxasya anupapattyā nityaiśvaryya-viśishṭatvena eva brahma-mīmāṁsā-vishayatvāvadhāraṇāt | brahma-śabdasya para-brahmaṇy eva mukhyatayā tu 'athātaḥ para-brahma-jijñāsā' iti na sūtritam iti | etena sāṇkhya-virodhād brahma-yoga-darśanayoḥ kāryyeśvara-paratvam api na śaṇkanīyam | prakṛiti-svātantryāpattyā 'rachanānupapatteścha na anumānam' ityādi brahma-sūtra-paramparā-'nupapatteścha | tathā 'sa purveshām api guruḥ kālena anavachchhedād' iti yoga-sūtra-tadīya-vyāsa-bhāshyābhyāṁ sphuṭam īśa-nityatāvagamāchcha iti | tasmād abhyupagama-vāda-prauḍhi-vādādinā eva sāṇkhyasya vyāvahārikeśvara-pratishedha-paratayā brahma-mīmāṁsā-yogābhyāṁ saha na virodhaḥ | abhyupagama-vādaścha śāstre dṛishṭaḥ | yathā Vishṇu-purāṇe (i. 17, 54) *| 'Ete bhinna-dṛiśaṁ daityā vikalpāḥ kathitā mayā | kṛitvā 'bhyupagamaṁ tatra saṇxepaḥ śrūyatām mama' | iti | astu vā pāpināṁ jñāna-pratibandhārtham āstika-darśaneshv apy aṁśataḥ śruti-viruddhārtha-vyavasthāpanaṁ teshu teshv aṁśeshv aprāmāṇyañcha | śruti-smṛity-aviruddheshu tu mukhya-vishayeshu prāmāṇyam asty eva | ata eva Padma-purāṇe brahma-yoga-darśanātiriktānāṁ darśanānām nindā 'py upapadyate | Yathā tatra Pārvatīm prati Īśvara-vākyam | 'śṛiṇu devi pravaxyāmi tāmasāni yathākramam | yeshāṁ śravaṇa-mātreṇa pātityaṁ jñāninām api | prathamaṁ hi mayaivoktaṁ śaivam Pāśupatādikam | machchhaktyāveśitair vipraiḥ samproktāni tataḥ param | Kaṇādena tu samproktaṁ śāstraṁ vaiśeshikam mahat | Gautamena tathā nyāyaṁ sāṇkhyaṁ tu Kapilena vai | dvijanmanā Jaimininā pūrvaṁ vedamayārthataḥ | nirīśvareṇa vādena kṛitam śāstram mahattaram | Dhishaṇena tathā proktam chārvākam ati-garhitam | daityānāṁ nāśanārthāya Vishṇunā Buddha-rūpiṇā | bauddha-śāstram asat proktaṁ nagna-nīla-paṭādikam | māyā-vādam asach-chhāstram prachchhannam bauddham eva cha | mayaiva kathitam devi kalau brāhmaṇa-rūpiṇā | apārthaṁ śruti-vākyānāṁ darśayat loka-garhitam | karma-svarūpa-tyājyatvam atra cha pratipādyate |*

sarva-karma-paribhraṁśād naishkarmyaṁ tatra chochyate | parātma-jīvayor aikyam mayā 'tra pratipādyate | brahmaṇo 'sya paraṁ rūpaṁ nirguṇaṁ darśitam mayā | sarvasya jagato 'py asya nāśanārthaṁ kalau yuge | vedārthavad mahāśāstram māyāvadam avaidikam | mayaiva kathitaṁ devi jagatāṁ nāśa-kāraṇād' | iti | adhikaṁ tu brahma-mīmāṁsā-bhāshye prapañchitam asmābhir iti | tasmād āstika-śāstrasya na kasyāpy aprāmāṇyaṁ virodho vā sva-sva-vishayeshu sarveshām abādhād avirodhāchcha iti | nanv evam purusha-bahutvāṁśe 'py asya śāstrasya abhyupagama-vādatvaṁ syāt | na syāt | avirodhāt | brahma-mīmāṁsāyām apy 'aṁśo nānā-vyapadesād' ityādi sūtra-jātair jīvātma-bahutvasyaiva nirṇayāt | sāṇkhya-siddha-purushāṇām atmatvaṁ tu brahma-mīmāṁsayā bādhyate eva | 'ātmā iti tūpayanti' iti tat-sūtreṇa paramātmana eva paramārtha-bhūmāv ātmatvāvadhāraṇāt | tathāpi cha sāṇkhyasya na aprāmāṇyam | vyāvahārikātmano jīvasya itara-viveka-jñānasya moxa-sādhanatve vivaxitārthe bādhābhāvāt | etena śruti-smṛiti-prasiddhayor nānātmaikātmatvayor vyāvahārika-pāramārthika-bhedena avirodhaḥ |

"Be it so: let there be here no discrepancy with the Nyāya and Vaiśeshika. But it will be said that the Sānkhya is really opposed to the Brahma-mīmānsā (the Vedanta) and the Yoga [of Patanjali]; since both of these systems assert an eternal Īśvara (God), while the Sānkhya denies such an Īśvara. And it must not be said (the same persons urge) that here also [as in the former case of the Nyāya and Vaiśeshika], owing to the distinction between practical [or conventional, or regulative] and essential truths, there may be no [real] contrariety between the theistic and the atheistic theories, inasmuch as it appears that the theistic theory has a view to devotion [and may therefore have nothing more than a practical end in view];—you are not, it will be said, to assert this, as there is nothing to lead to this conclusion [or, distinction]. For as Īśvara is difficult to be known, the atheistic theory also, which is founded on popular opinion, may, indeed, be maintained for the purpose of inspiring indifference to

the divine majesty, (just as it is [erroneously] asserted that soul has [the three] qualities); but neither the Veda, nor any other śāstra contains a distinct denial of an Īśvara, by which the *merely* practical [or conventional] character of the theistic theory could be shewn. [Consequently the theistic theory is not a mere conventional one, but true, and the contradiction between the atheistic Sānkhya and the theistic systems is real and irreconcileable].

To this we reply: in this case also the distinction of practical and essential truths holds. For the *atheistic* theory is censured by such texts as the following: 'They declare a world without an Īśvara to be false and baseless.' Now it was proper that in this system (the Sānkhya), the merely practical [or conventional] denial [of Īśvara] should be inculcated for the purpose of inspiring indifference to the divine majesty, and so forth. Because the idea of the author of the Sānkhya was this, that if the existence of an eternal Īśvara were not denied, in conformity with the doctrine of the Laukāyatikas, men would be prevented by the contemplation of a perfect, eternal, and faultless godhead, and by fixing their hearts upon it, from studying to discriminate [between spirit and matter]. But no censure on the *theistic* theory is to be found in any religious work, whereby [the scope of] that system might be restricted, as having devotion, etc., in view, as its only end. And as regards such texts as the following:—'There is no knowledge like the Sānkhya, no power like the Yoga; doubt not of this, the knowledge of the Sānkhya is considered to be the highest,' they [are to be understood as] proving the superiority of the Sānkhya doctrine over other systems, not in respect of its atheism, but only of its discrimination [between different principles]. In the same way it is established by the colloquy of Parāśara, and all other well-instructed persons, that the theistic theory is that which represents the essential truth. Further, such texts as the following of the Parāśara Upapurana, and other works, shew the strength of the Brahma-

mīmānsā on the side of its theism, viz., 'In the systems of Axapāda (Gotama) and Kanāda, and in the Sānkhya and Yoga, that part which is opposed to the Veda should be rejected by all persons who regard the Veda as the sole authority. In the systems of Jaimini and Vyāsa (the Vedānta) there is no portion contrary to the Veda, since both these sages, by [adhering to] the Veda [itself], have obtained a perfect comprehension of its true meaning.' In the same way it results from this text of the Moxa-dharma (a part of the Śānti-parva of the Mahābhārata), viz.: 'Many systems of reasoning have been promulgated by different authors; [in these] whatever is established on grounds of reason, of scripture, and of approved custom, is to be respected;' [from this text also, I say, it results] that the theory,—declared in the Brahma-mīmānsā, the Nyāya, the Vaiśeshika, etc., in consonance with the tradition of Parāśara and all other well-instructed men,—which asserts an Īśvara, is alone to be received, in consequence of its strength; and [it is] also [to be received] because in such passages as this of the Kaurma-purana, viz.,—'Take refuge with that Maheśvara, that Brahma without beginning or end, whom the most eminent Yogis, and the Sānkhyas *do not behold*,'—Nārāyaṇa (Vishnu) asserts that the Sānkhyas are ignorant of Īśvara.

Moreover, Īśvara is determined to be the principal subject of the Brahma-mīmānsā by the introductory statement, etc., of that system. If it were open to objection on that side [*i.e.*, on the side of its principal subject], the entire system would be without authority. For it is a rule of logic that 'the sense of a word is that which it is intended to denote.' But the principal subjects of the Sānkhya are—(1) the grand object of human pursuit, and—(2) the distinction between nature (*prakriti*) and spirit (*purusha*), which is the instrument of attaining that grand object. Thus the Sānkhya does not lose its authority, even though it be erroneous in so far as it denies an Īśvara. For it is a rule of logic that 'the sense of a word is that which it is intended to denote.' Hence, from its being an

essential point, the Sānkhya is weak in so far as it denies an Īśvara.

Nor can it be alleged that it is Īśvara only, and not the eternity of his existence, that is the principal subject of the Brahma-mīmānsā; since, through the disproof of the objection (*pūrva-paxa*) that the theistic theory 'is chargeable with the defect of rendering the smṛiti inapplicable,'[13] it is ascertained that the assertion of an eternal Īśvara *is* the main object of the Brahma-mīmānsā. But as the word *Brahma* is principally employed to denote the *supreme Brahma*, the first aphorism of the Brahma-mīmānsā does not run thus, 'Now follows the enquiry regarding the *supreme Brahma;*' but thus, 'Now follows the enquiry regarding *Brahma*.' Hence we are not to surmise that, from their [otherwise] contradicting the Sānkhya, the Brahma-mīmānsā and Yoga systems must aim at establishing [not an eternal Deity] but a [secondary] Īśvara, who is merely an *effect*. For this is disproved (1) by the Brahma Sūtra (ii. 2, 1) which (founding on the objection that exists to the independent action of *Pradhāna* or nature) concludes that 'an unintelligent cause of the world cannot be inferred, as it is not conceivable that it should have been framed by such a

[13] I extract here the entire aphorism referred to (Brahma Sūtras, ii. 1, 1), with a few lines of S'ankara's commentary: *Smṛity-anavakāśa-dosha-prasaṇga iti chet | na | anya-smṛity-anavakāśa-dosha-prasaṇgāt' ‖ . . . . tatra prathamaṁ tāvat smṛiti-virodham upanyasya pariharati | yad uktam Brahma eva sarvajñaṁ jagataḥ kāraṇam iti tad ayuktam | kutaḥ | smṛity-anavakāśa-dosha-prasaṇgāt | . . . . . tasya samādhiḥ | 'na | anya-smṛity-anavakāśa-dosha-prasaṇgād' iti | yadi smṛity-anavakāśa-dosha-prasaṇgena Iśvara-kāraṇa-vādaḥ āxipyeta evam apy anyā Iśvara-kāraṇa-vādinyaḥ smṛitayo 'navakāśā prasajyeran |* (Sūtra) "'If it be said that [this theory] is [wrong, as it is] chargeable with the defect of rendering the *smṛiti* inapplicable [or contradicting the *smṛiti*], [I answer] No, for [the other theory] would be chargeable with the defect of rendering *other* texts of the *smṛiti* inapplicable.' (Comment) Here, he first of all proposes and removes the objection of contrariety to the *smṛiti*. 'It is wrong,' says the objector, 'to assert that Brahma is the omniscient cause of the world.' Why? 'Because the fault of making the *smṛiti* inapplicable attaches [to this theory]. . . . The difficulty is removed in this way: 'No, for [the other theory] would be chargeable with the defect of rendering other texts of the *smṛiti* inapplicable.' Even if the theory of divine causality were rejected on the ground of rendering the *smṛiti* inapplicable, still [the antagonistic theory] would be open to the objection of rendering inapplicable those *other* texts of the *smṛiti* which assert a divine causality."

cause,' and by the series of the following sūtras; and (2) by the fact that the eternity of God is clearly understood from the Yoga aphorism [i. 26], viz., 'He is also the instructor of the ancients, as he is not circumscribed by time,' as well as from the commentary of Vyāsa thereon.[14] Thus [if we take into account the difference between] the exoteric and esoteric methods of discussion,[15] [we shall find that] as the Sānkhya has in view a [merely] practical denial of an Īśvara, it does not contradict the Brahma-mīmānsā or the Yoga. The exoteric method [or method of *approach*, to which allusion has been made] is referred to in the Śāstra. Thus it is said in the Vishnu Purana [i. 17, 54, Wilson, p. 132], 'These notions, Daityas, which I have described, are the mistakes of persons who look on the Deity as distinct from themselves. Hear now briefly from me [the views of those who] have made an *approach* [? to the truth].'

"Or let it be [supposed] that even theistic systems, with the view of preventing sinners from attaining knowledge, lay down doctrines which are partially opposed to the Veda; and that in those particular portions they are not authoritative. Still, in their principal contents, which are consonant to the *śruti* and the *smṛiti*, they possess authority. Accordingly, in the Padma Purana we find a censure passed even upon the several philosophical systems (*darśanas*), with the exception of the Brahma (the Vedānta) and the Yoga. For in that work Īśvara (Mahādeva) says to Pārvatī, 'Listen, goddess, while I declare to you the *tāmasa* works (the works characterised by *tamas*, or the quality of darkness) in order; works by the mere hearing of

[14] I quote the commentary of Bhoja-rājā on this Sūtra, as given by Dr. Ballantyne (Aphorisms of the Yoga, part first, p. 32): *Pūrveshām | ādyānām Brahmādīnām api sa gurur upadeshṭā yataḥ sa kālena anavachchhidyate anāditvāt | teshām punar ādimattvād asti kālena avachchhedaḥ* | "Of the ancients, that is, of the earliest [beings], Brahmā and the rest, he is the *guru*, *i.e.*, the instructor, because He, as having no beginning, is not circumscribed by time; while they, on the other hand, having had a beginning, *are* circumscribed by time."

[15] I suppose from the context that the expressions *abhyupagama-vāda*, "the mode of discussion which *approaches* the truth," and *praudhi-vāda*, "the mode of discussion suited to *advanced* knowledge," answer in some measure to our idea of exoteric and esoteric systems respectively.

which even wise men become fallen. First of all, the Śaiva systems, called Pāśupata, etc., were delivered by myself. Then the following were uttered by Brahmans penetrated by my power, viz. (2), the great Vaiśeshika system of which Kanāda was the author, and (3) the Nyāya and (4) Sānkhya, which were promulgated by Gotama and Kapila respectively. Then (5) the great system, the Pūrva-[mīmānsā] was composed by the Brahman Jaimini from Vedic materials, but on atheistic principles. So too (6) the abominable Chārvāka doctrine was declared by Dhishaṇa,[15] while Vishnu, in the form of Buddha, with a view to the destruction of the Daityas,[16] promulgated (7) the false system of the Bauddhas, who go about naked, or wear blue garments. I myself, goddess, assuming the form of a Brahman, uttered in the Kali age, the untrue theory of *māyā* [illusion, the more modern form of the Vedānta], which is covert Buddhism, which imputes a perverted and generally censured signification to the words of the Veda, and inculcates the abandonment of ceremonial works, and an inactivity consequent on such cessation. In that system I propound the identity of the supreme and the embodied soul, and show that the highest form of Brahma is that in which he is devoid of the [three] qualities. It was I myself, goddess, by whom this great śāstra, which, composed of Vedic materials and inculcating the theory of illusion, is yet un-Vedic, was declared in the Kali age for the destruction of this entire universe.' We have entered into fuller explanations on this subject in the Brahma-mīmānsā-bhāshya. There is, therefore, no want of authority, nor any contradiction, in any theistic system, for they are all incapable of refutation in their own especial subjects, and are not mutually discrepant. Does, then, this system (the Sānkhya) lay down a merely exoteric theory in respect of the multitude of souls also? It does not. For in the Brahma-mīmānsā also it is determined by such kinds of texts as the following (Brahma Sūtras, ii.

[15] A name of Vrihaspati, according to Wilson's dictionary.

[16] See Wilson's Vishnu Purana, pp. 334 ff.

3, 43), viz., 'the embodied spirit is a part of the supreme soul, from the variety of appellations,' that there is a multitude of embodied spirits. But it is denied by the Brahma-mīmānsā that the spirits (*purusha*) asserted by the Sankhya have the character of Soul; for it is determined by the Brahma Sūtra (iv. 1, 3), 'they approach Him as one with themselves,'[17] that on the ground of transcendental truth, the supreme Soul alone has the character of Soul. But, nevertheless, the Sānkhya is not unauthoritative; for as the other discriminative knowledge possessed by the embodied spirit in its worldly condition is instrumental to final liberation, this system is not erroneous in the particular subject matter which it aims at propounding. In this way it results from the distinction of practical and real which exists between the two theories (made known by the *śruti* (Veda) and *smṛiti*), of a multitude of souls, and the unity of all soul, that [the Sānkhya] is not contrary [to the Vedānta]."

Note IX. *on Page* 112, *Line* 22.

Sāyana's Introduction to R. V. vol i. p. 23.—*Manushya-vṛittānta-pratipādakā ṛicho nārāśaṁśyaḥ* | "The *nārāsanśīs* are verses which set forth the histories of men."

If these *nārāśansīs* were *ṛichaḥ*, verses of the hymns, and if, according to Sāyana's definition, their object was to record events in human history, it follows that these verses must have referred to non-eternal objects. Either therefore Sāyana's definition must be wrong, or the author of the Mīmānsā Sūras must have made a mistake in asserting that the hymns contain no reference to events which have taken place *in time*.

[17] The original Sūtra runs thus: *Ātmā iti tu upagachchhanti grāhayanti cha* | "They approach Him as one with themselves, and [certain texts] cause them to receive Him as one with themselves." This refers to certain texts which S'ankara adduces from one of the Upanishads, apparently.

NOTE X. *on Page* 126, *Line* 15.

The expression here employed, *pitṛīṉāñcha manmabhiḥ*, is repeated in R. V. x. 57, 3 (= Vāj. Sanh. 3, 53): *Mano nu ā huvāmahe nārāśaṁsena somēna pitṛīṉāñcha manmabhiḥ* | "We invoke his spirit with soma accompanied by human praises, and by the hymns [or prayers] of the fathers."

The Vāj. San. Sanhitā reads *stomena*, "hymn," instead of *somena*. The commentator there explains *nārāśaṁsena stotreṉa* as a "hymn in which men are praised," and *pitṛīṉāñcha manmabhiḥ* as hymns "in which the fathers are reverenced" (*pitaro yaiḥ stotrair manyante te manmānas tair ityādi*).

NOTE XI. *on Page* 148, *4th Line from the bottom.*

I should have recalled attention here to the verse of the Purusha Sūkta, R. V. x. 90, 9, quoted in p. 10, and also in Part First, pp. 7 and 8, in which the Rik and Sāma verses, the metres, and the Yajush are said to have sprung from the great mystical victim Purusha.

We have also seen that in the passage of the Atharva-veda cited at the top of p. 11, two of the Vedas are said to have *sprung from Time*. The same Veda, as quoted by Prof. Goldstücker in the Preface to his Mānava-kalpa-sūtra, p. 70, assigns yet another origin to the Vedas. Ath. V. xi. 7, 24: *Ṛichaḥ sāmāni chhandāṁsi purāṇaṁ yajushā sahā* | *uchchhishṭāj jajñire ityādi* | "The Ṛik and Sāma verses, the metres, the Purana, with the Yajus, sprang from the *remainder of the sacrifice*."

NOTE XII. *on Page* 149, *3rd Line from the foot.*

It appears from Prof. Benfey's note on S. V. ii. 294 (= R. V. ix. 96, 6, quoted in p. 163), that the scholiast on that passage also makes *devānām* = *ṛitvijām*, "priests."

NOTE XIII. *on Page* 176, *Line* 12.

In R. V. x. 57, 2, we find the same word *tantu* occurring: *Yo yajñasya prasādhanas tantur deveshu ātatas tam āhutaṁ naśīmahi* | "May we obtain [?] him [Agni?] whom we have invoked, who is the fulfiller of sacrifice, who is the thread stretched to the gods."

Prof. Roth quotes under the word *tantu* the following text from the Taittirīya Brahmana, ii. 4, 2, 6: *Ā tantum Agnir divyaṁ tatāna* | *tvaṁ nas tantur uta setur Agne tvam panthā bhavasi deva-yānaḥ* | "Agni has stretched the divine thread. Thou, Agni, art our thread and bridge; thou art the path leading to the gods."

ADDITIONAL NOTE, *on Page* 5, *Line* 14, *and Page* 213, *Line* 1, *of the Appendix.*

The following passages from Patanjali's Mahābhāshya, and from the commentaries of Kaiyyaṭa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa, are extracted from fuller quotations given by Prof. Goldstücker in pp. 147, 148, of the very learned Preface to his Mānava-kalpa-sūtra.

Patanjali.—*Nanu cha uktaṁ 'na hi chhandāṁsi kriyante nityāni chhandāṁsi' iti* | *yadyapy artho nityaḥ* | *yā tv asau varṇānupūrvī sā anityā tad-bhedāch-cha etad bhavati Kāṭhakaṁ Kālāpakam Maudakam Paippalādakam ityādi* . . . | Kaiyyaṭa.—*'Nityāni' iti* | *karttur asmaraṇāt teshām iti bhāvaḥ* | *'yā tv asāv' iti* | *mahāpralayādishu varṇānupūrvī-vināśe punar utpadya ṛishayaḥ saṁskārātiśayād vedārthaṁ smṛitvā śabda-rachanā vidadhati ity arthaḥ* | *'tad-bhedād' iti* | *ānupurvī-bhedād ity arthaḥ* | *tataścha Kaṭhādayo vedānupūrvyāḥ karttāraḥ eva ityādi* | Nāgojibhaṭṭa.—*Aṁśena vedasya nityatvaṁ svīkṛitya aṁśena anityatvam āha 'yadyapy arthaḥ' iti* | *anena vedatvaṁ*

śabdārthobhaya-vṛitti-dhvanitvam | nanu 'dhātā yathā pūrvam akalpayad' ityādi-śruti-balena ānupūrvī api sā eva iti navya-pūrva-mīmāṁsā-siddhāntāt sā nityā iti ayuktam ata āha 'mahā-pralayādishv' iti | ānupūrvyās tat-tat-xaṇa-ghaṭitatveṇa anityatvam iti bhāvaḥ iti kechit | tanna | 'yadyapy artho nityaḥ' ityādi-vākya-śesha-virodhāt | arthasyāpi jyotishṭomāder anityatvāt | pravāhāvichchhedena nityatvaṁ tu ubhayor api tasmād manvantara-bhedena ānupūrvī bhinnā eva 'prati-manvantara-rañchaishā śrutir anyā vidhīyate' ity ukter ity anye | pare tu | 'artho nityaḥ' ity atra kṛitakatva-virodhy-anityatvasya eva abhyupagamaḥ pūrva-paxiṇā tādṛiśa-nityatvasya eva chhandassu ukteḥ | evañcha artha-śabdena atra īśvaraḥ | mukhyatayā tasya eva sarva-veda-tātpāryya-vishayatvāt | 'vedaiścha sarvair aham eva vedyaḥ' iti Gītokter ity āhuḥ | varṇānupūrvyāḥ anityatve mānam āha 'tad-bhedāchcha' iti | anityatva-vyāpya-bhedena tat-siddhiḥ | bhedo 'tra nānātvam | Īśvare tu na nānātvam | bhede mānaṁ vyavahāram āha | 'Kāṭhaka' ityādi | arthaikye 'py ānupūrvī-bhedād eva Kāṭhaka-kālāpakādi-vyavahāraḥ iti bhāvaḥ | atra ānupūrvī anityā ity ukteḥ padāni tāny eva iti dhvanitvaṁ tad āha tataścha Kaṭhādayaḥ ityādi |

As Prof. Goldstücker has only given (in p. 146 of his Preface) a translation of the above extract from Patanjali, and has left the passages from Kaiyyata and Nagojibhatta untranslated, I shall give his version of the first, and my own rendering of the two last.

Patanjali.—"Is it not said, however, that 'the Vedas are not made, but that they are permanent (*i.e.*, eternal)?' (Quite so); yet, though their sense is permanent, the order of their letters has not always remained the same; and it is through the difference in this latter respect that we may speak of the versions of the Kaṭhas, Kalāpas, Mudakas, Pippalādakas, and so on."

Kaiyyaṭa on Patanjali.—"'Eternal;' by this word he means that they are so, because no maker of them is remembered. By the words, 'the order of their letters,' etc., it is meant that, the order of the letters being destroyed in the great dissolutions of

the universe, etc., the rishis, when they are again produced, recollecting, through their eminent science, the sense of the Veda, arrange the order of the words. By the phrase, 'through the difference of this,' is meant the difference of order. Consequently, Katha and the other sages [to whom allusion was made] are the authors of the order of the Veda." *Nagojibhaṭṭa on Patanjali and Kaiyyaṭa.*—"Admitting in part the eternity of the Veda, he declares in the words, 'though the sense is eternal,' etc., that it is also in part *not* eternal. By this clause, *vedicity*, or the essence of the Veda, is [declared to consist in] being sound composed of both its constituents, viz., *words* and their *meanings*. But is not the order eternal, since it is a settled doctrine, both of the new and the elder Mīmānsakas,[18] on the strength of such Vedic texts as this, 'the creator made them as before,' etc., that the order also is the very same? No; this is incorrect, and in consequence, he says, 'in the great dissolutions,' etc. Some say the meaning of this is, that the order is not eternal, inasmuch as it exists in particular [or successive] moments. But this is wrong, because it is opposed to the rest of the sentence, viz., the words, 'though their sense is eternal,' etc., and because the objects signified also, such as the *jyotishṭoma* sacrifice, are not eternal. Others say that both the sense and the order of the words are eternal [or permanent], owing to the continuity of the tradition; and that consequently it is in different manvantaras that the order of the words is different, according to the text, 'in every manvantara this śruti (Veda) is made different.' Others again think that in the words, 'the sense is eternal,' etc., an assertion is made by an objector of a non-eternity opposed to [mere] *production*, since it is only such a [qualified] eternity [or permanence] that is mentioned in the Veda; and that thus the word 'sense,' or 'object' (*arthaḥ*), here refers to Īśvara, because he is the principal object which is had in view in the whole of the Veda, according to the words of the Bhagavad-gītā (xv. 15),

[18] This means, I suppose, Vedantins and Purva Mīmānsakas.

'It is I whom all the Vedas seek to know.' He next states the proof of the assertion that the order of the letters is not eternal, in the words, 'through the difference of this,' etc. The difference in the order is proved by the difference in the things included under the category of non-eternity. Difference here means variety. But in Īśvara (God), there is no variety. He declares ordinary practice to be the proof of difference, in the words 'Kāthaka,' etc., which mean that, though the sense is the same, we use the distinctions of Kāthaka, Kālāpaka, etc., in consequence of the difference of order. Here by saying that the order is not eternal, it is meant that the words are the same, and thus the [full] character [of the Veda], as sound [consisting both of words and their meanings, is preserved?]. And this is what is asserted in the words, 'consequently Katha and the other sages,' etc."

After quoting these passages at greater length than I have given them, Prof. Goldstücker goes on to remark in his note: "I have quoted the full gloss of the three principal commentators, on this important Sūtra [of Panini] and its Vārttikas, because it is of considerable interest in many respects. . . . We see Kaiyyaṭa and Nagojibhaṭṭa writhing under the difficulty of reconciling the eternity of the Veda with the differences of its various versions, which, nevertheless, maintain an equal claim to infallibility. Patanjali makes rather short work of this much vexed question; and unless it be allowed here to render his expression *varṇa* (which means 'letter'), 'word,' it is barely possible even to understand how he can save consistently the eternity or permanence of the 'sense' of the Veda. That the modern Mīmānsists maintain not only the 'eternity of the sense,' but also the 'permanence of the text,' which is tantamount to the exclusive right of one single version, we learn, amongst others, from Nāgojibatta. But as such a doctrine has its obvious dangers, it is not shared in by the old Mīmānsists, nor by Nāgoji, as he tells us himself. He and Kaiyyaṭa inform us therefore that *amongst other* theories, there is one, according

to which the order of the letters (or rather words) in the Vaidik texts got lost in the several Pralayas or destructions of the worlds; and since each Manwantara had its own revelation, which differed only in the expression, not in the sense of the Vaidik texts, the various versions known to these commentators represent these successive revelations, which were 'remembered,' through their 'excessive accomplishments,' by the Ṛishis, who in this manner produced, or rather reproduced, the texts current in their time, under the name of the versions of the Kaṭhas, Kalāpas, and so on. In this way each version had an equal claim to sanctity. There is a very interesting discussion on the same subject by Kumārila, in his Mīmānsā-vārttika (i. 3, 10)."

INDEX.

A.

Abhyupagama-vāda, 224
Accentuation, 18
Achāryya, 202
Achyuta, 26
Aditi, 122, 140, 156
Ādityas, 70, 130, 140
Adhoxaja, 28
Adhvaryu, 3, 35, 37 f.
Ādhvaryava (Yajur) Veda, 110
Adṛishṭa, 83, 216
Agastya, 143
Agni, 18, 28, 51, 117, 120, 122, 123, 125, 126–129 passim, 132–140 passim, 144, 145, 147, 149, 152, 164, 170, 173, 174, 176, 180, 227
Agni a source of inspiration, 156 ff.
Agnihotra, 55
Ahaṇkāra, 102
Aila (Purūravas), 29
Air, 3 ff., 43
Aitareya Br., 4
Alcinous, 166
Ancients, 95
Anga, 35
Angis, 18
Angiras, 18, 117, 120, 126, 142, 147, 188
Angirases, 141
Anukramanis, 89, 172
Anushṭubh, 7, 176
Anuvyākhyānas, 105
Apāntaratamas, 23
Āpastamba, 44, 91
Apaurusheyatva, 43
Apollo, 165 ff.
Apsaras, 104, 143
Āpta, 209 f.
Āraṇyakas, 1, 15
Argives, 167
Arjuna, 186
Arka, 120
Arthavādas, 70, 95
Aryaman, 164
Āsuri, 99
Aśmaka, 35
Asridh, 122
Astronomy, 19
Asura, 156
Asuras, 31, 174
Āśvalāyana, 91
Aśvattha, 28
Aśvins, 117, 124, 129, 132 f., 138, 139, 140
Atirātra, 7
Ativyāpti, 204
Atharvan, priest, 37
Atharvan, sage, 18, 117, 120, 157, 182
Atharvāngirases, 8, 27, 104
Atharva Pariśishṭas, 36 f.
Atharvaṇas, 37
Atharva-veda quoted, 10, 120, 155, 158, 159, 176, 227
Atri, 117, 119, 173, 188
Atris, 139, 173
Auddālaki, 60
Aufrecht, Cat. of Bodl. Sans. MSS., 17, 22, 33
Aupamanyava, 111
Axapāda (Gotama), 222
Ayāsya, 136
Ayātayāma, 33
Āyur-veda, 80, 215

B.

Babara, 60, 61, 63, 112
Bādarāyana, 47, 50, 51, 65
Bahvṛichas, 27, 35, 37
Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Mīmānsa, 52 ff.
Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Nyāya, 74 ff., 216 f.
——— Aphorisms of the Sānkhya, 81
——— Aphorisms of the Vedanta, 50, 52
——— Aphorisms of the Yoga, 223
——— Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy, 72, 112, 216
——— Mahābhāshya, 72, 155
——— Siddhānta-muktāvali, 216
——— Synopsis of Science, 103
——— Tarka-sangraha, 209
Banerjea, Rev. Prof. K. M., 185, 207, 208, 209, 210, 216
Bauddhas, 93, 203, 210, 225
Baudhāyana, 91
Benfey, Sāma-veda, 71, 118, 119, 127, 128, 134, 135, 137, 145, 153, 161, 163, 174, 227
Bhaga, 122
Bhagavad-gītā, 100, 185, 230
Bhāgavata-purāna, 7, 24, 27, 99, 100, 107, 188 f.
Bharadvāja, 18
Bharadvājas, 118
Bharatas, 173
Bhāratī, 151, 152, 155
Bhārgava, 37
Bhāshā-parichcheda, 216
Bhoja-rāja, 224
Bhūr, 3, 4, 6, 10, 72
Bhuvaḥ, 3, 4, 6, 10
Bhṛigu, 26, 117, 120, 188
Bhṛigus, 38, 129, 130, 132 f.
Bird, 156

Blackie, on the Theology of Homer, 169
Boehtlingk and Roth, Sanskrit Dictionary, 49, 120, 136, 138, 146, 158, 159, 227
Brahmă, 13, 18, 25, 26, 66, 97, 106, 180, 181, 182, 187, 188, 223
Brahmā, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 31, 144, 162, 182 f., 188, 213.
Brahma-mīmānsā, 217, 220 ff.
Brahma-mīmānsā-bhāshya, 225
Brahman (prayer), 121, 144
——— (priest), 37 f.
Brahmans, 23, 29, 65
Brahmaṇas, 1, 2, 39, 43 ff., 104 f., 113
Brahmanaspati, 130, 145, 149, 158, 160
Brahmarāta, 32, 34
Brahmarshis, 26
Brahma Sūtras, 45, 50, 51, 52, 65, 94 ff., 97, 180, 207, 213, 223, 225
Brahma-vādis, 102
Brahma-veda, 37
Brahma-vidyā, 18
Brahma-vaivartta-purana, 17
Brahmeśa, 27
Bṛihaspati, see Vṛihaspati
Bṛihati metre, 176
Buddha, 108, 225

C.

Calchas, 168
Caste, 28, 29
Chaitra, 200
Chaitya, 12
Chāndāla, 187
Charaṇavyūha, 39
Charaṇa, 33, 35
Charakas, 35 f.
Charakācharyya, 35 f.
Charakādhvaryus, 33, 35 f.
Chārvākas, 12, 45, 225
Chhandas, 106
Chhandoga, 17
Chhandogas, 35, 37 f.
Chhāndogya Brāhmaṇa, 92
Chhāndogya Upanishad, 3 ff., 106 f., 182 f., 186 f.
Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, 45, 47, 51, 52, 57, 66, 72, 83, 89, 100, 156, 161, 176, 178, 186, 209, 211
Commentary, 19
Commentaries on the Vedas, 2
——— on the Darśanas, 2
Commentators, 39

D.

Dadhyanch, 117, 120
Daityas, 225
Danti, 161
Darśanas, 2, 103
Daxa, 122, 188
Demodocus, 166 f.
Devas, 119, 149, 160, 227
Devadatta, 70
Dhī, 121
Dhishaṇa, 225
Dhishaṇā, 121, 151, 152, 153, 175
Dhīti, 121
Dīrghaśrut, 116
Dissolution of the Universe, 213
Dushkṛita, 35
Dvaipāyana, 24
Dvāpara age, 20, 21, 22, 26

E.

Egyptians, 95
Ekaviñśa, 7
Elemental origin of the Vedas, 3 ff.
Euripides, 162

G.

Gaṇāmbikā, 161
Gandharva, 156, 158 f.
Gandharvas, 27 ff.
Ganeśa, 161
Gaurī, 161
Gaya, 140
Gāyatra, 7
Gāyatrī, 6, 7, 8, 159, 161, 173, 176
———, varieties of, 161
———, mother of the Vedas, 9
Giriśa, 188
Gods, 66, 69 f.
Gaurava, 111
Gir, 121
Goldstücker's Dictionary, 120
——— Mānava-kalpa-sūtra, 227, 228 ff.
Gotama, author of Nyāya Sūtras, 73 ff., 216, 222
Gotama, rishi, 131
Gotamas, 129, 134, 138, 139
Grammar, 19, 105
Grecian bards, 165 ff.
Gṛitsamadas, 129, 131
Grote's History of Greece, 165, 167, 168 f.
Guṇas, 102
Guru, 91, 199

H.

Hall, Sānkhya Prav. Bh., 96, 100
Hansa, 29
Hanta, 150
Hari, 28, 189
Haridāsa Bhattāchāryya, 211
Harivanśa quoted, 8, 9, 10
Helicon, 165
Hellas, 168
Herodotus, 95, 108
Hesiod, 95, 165 ff.
Hiranyagarbha, 9, 183
Homer, 165 ff.
Hotrā, 151
Hotṛi, 3
Hymns, see Mantras

I.

Inferior science, 18
Ilā, 151, 152, 155
Iliad, 166, 168, 169
Ilion, 168
Indra, 29, 70, 117, 118, 120, 123–131 passim, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 147, 148, 152, 156, 163, 170, 173, 174, 180, 181, 189
———, sceptical doubts regarding, 151
———, source of inspiration, 159 f.
Īśvara, 43, 82, 107, 180, 209 f., 211 ff., 220 ff., 230
Īśvara (Mahādeva), 224

Itihāsas, 2, 8, 17, 22, 24, 73, 90, 94 ff., 104 f., 106 f., 186 f.

J.

Jagatī metre, 7, 173, 176
Jaimini, 22, 24, 27, 66, 87, 112, 116, 190, 207, 221, 225
Jalada, 37
Jamadagni, 153
Jan (to generate), 128, 133
Janaka, 38
Janamejaya, 35
Janārdana, 189
Jaradgava, 63, 64
Jātavedas, 134, 137, 138, 158
John (St.), his First Epistle, 135
———— his Gospel, 135
Jupiter, 165 ff.
Jyotishṭoma, 49, 64, 65

K.

Kaiyyaṭa, 228 ff.
Kalanja, 49
Kalāpa, 200, 216
Kalāpas, 229
Kālāpa, 200
Kālāpaka, 62, 216, 230
Kālātyayāpadishṭa, 216 f.
Kalchas, 167
Kali-yuga, 225
Kālidāsa, 50, 51, 88, 91, 197, 202
Kaṇāda, 98, 222, 225
Kaṇva, 117, 125, 140, 148
Kaṇvas, 148
Kalpa or ceremonial Institutes, 19, 91 f., 103, 105 f.
Kapila, 20, 84, 95, 96 ff., 181, 213, 225
Kapinjala, 137
Karmasiddhi, 161
Kārttikeya, 161
Kaśyapa, 183
Kaṭha (sage), 60, 61, 87, 200, 215 f.
Kaṭhas, 229
Kaṭha Upanishad, 19
Kāṭhaka, 59 ff., 87 ff., 200, 216, 230
Kātyāyana, 91
Kaurma-purāna, 222
Kausika, 145
Kaushītakī Br., 4
Kaushītakins, 39
Kauthuma, 59 f., 87 ff.
Kautsa, 108
Kavi, 116, 147
Khila, 35
Kīkaṭas, 62, 112
Kratu, 188
Kṛi (to make), 128
Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana, 21, 22
Krita yuga, 20, 23, 29, 30
Kshattriya, 95
Kullūka on Manu, 5, 11, 12, 15, 92, 213
Kumārila, 190, 209, 230
Kuśikas, 129, 144 f.
Kusumānjali, 180, 196, 205, 211 ff.
Kusurubinda, 60
Kuthumi, 60, 87
Kutsa, 111

L.

Langlois, translation of the Rig-veda, 119, 176
Lassen, Ind. Ant., 21
Laukāyatikas, 221
Linga-purana, 161
Lokāyata, 209
Lomaharshaṇa, 24

M.

Mādhava, author of Nyāya-mālā-Vistara, 87
————, author of the Sarva-darśana-sangraha, 190
————, author of the Vedārtha-prakāsa, on T. S., 5, 44, 47 ff., 88
Madhu, 21
Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, 101 ff., 217
Madras, 64
Maghavan, 118, 119, 134, 144, 148, 160
Mahābhārata, 22, 50, 60, 88, 197 f., 215
———— quoted, 5, 10, 21, 23, 30, 31, 51, 90, 92, 97, 100, 106
Mahābhāshya, 155
Mahādeva, 5, 161
Mahāsena (Kārttikeya), 161
Mahat, 102
Maheśvara, 5, 71, 222
Mahīdhara on the Vāj. San., 189
Maitreya, 20
Mālatī Mādhava, 199
Man, 175 f.
Māndhātri, 126
Māna (Agastya), 143
Mānamanohara, 202
Mānava-kalpa-sūtra, 228 ff.
Manīshā, 121
Manman, 121
Mantras, 1, 26, 43 ff., 80, 121, 187
————, magical power ascribed to, 172 ff.
Manu, 22, 23, 92 ff., 97 117, 119, 122, 142, 182 f., 188
Manu's Institutes, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 30, 43, 90, 93
Manvantaras, 11, 21, 24
Marīchi, 188
Maruts, 70, 123, 125, 127, 131, 139, 144, 147, 149
Mati, 121
Matsya Purana, 35
Mauda, 37
Māyā, 102
Medhātithi, 5
Medhāvi, 116
Meru, 32, 34
Mitra, 122, 124, 132, 136, 143, 149, 164, 176, 180
Mīmānsa, see Pūrva-mīmānsa
Mīmānsakas, 56, 73 ff., 93 f., 102, 179 f., 190 ff.
————, their alleged atheism, 207 ff.
Mīmānsa-vārttika, 209, 230
Moxa-dharma, 222
Mudakas, 229
Müller, M., 43, 132
———— Ancient Sanskrit Lit., 19, 35, 39, 80, 93, 105, 177, 178
———— Oxford Essay, 26
———— Jour. of Ger. Or. Soc., 49, 72, 95
Mundaka Up., 17, 103, 105 f., 181 f.
Munis, 101 f., 116
Muses, 165 ff.

N.

Nābhāka, 126
Nābhāka, 126
Nägelbach's Nachhomerische Theologie, 171
Nāgojibhaṭṭa, 228 ff.
Nahusha, 181
Naichaśākha, 62.
Naiyāyikas, 179 f., 190 ff., 203
Nāsatyas (Aśvins), 136
Nārada, 186 f., 188 f.
Nārāyaṇa, 22, 28, 29, 222
Nārāyaṇa-tīrtha, 211
Nigada, 27
Nigama, 91
Nirukta, 45 f., 90, 91, 105, 109 ff., 126, 142, 143, 150, 154, 175, 210
Nītha, 121
Nivid, 121
Nodhas, 131
Nyāya, 101, 112, 220
—— Sūtras, 73 ff., 84, 210, 216
——————, are they theistic? 210, 216
Nyāya-bhūshaṇa, 191, 203
Nyāya-mālā-vistara, 86 ff., 90 ff., 93 f.
Nyāya-sūtra-vṛitti, 73

O.

Odyssey, 166 f., 169 f.
Olympian Muses, 165
Oṁkāra, 25, 26, 29
Oracles, 170

P.

Padma-purāṇa, 209, 224
Paila, 22, 24, 27, 190
Paingins, 39
Paippalāda, 37
Panchadaśa-stoma, 7
Pandits, 103
Pāṇini, 39, 87, 200
Parameśvara, 43, 183, 188 f., 196, 198 f.
Parāśara, 22, 24, 27, 221 f.
Parāśara Upapurāṇa, 221
Parjanya, 149
Pārvatī, 224
Pāśupata system, 225
Pāśupatas, 102
Pātanjalas, 102
Patanjali, Mahābhāshya, 39, 228 ff.
—— Yoga, 220 ff.
Paulkasa, 187
Paurusheya, 8, 50, 82
Paurusheyatva, 199
Pavana, 3
Pertsch, alphabetical list of initial words of *ṛichas*, 71
Phemius, 167
Phæacians, 166
Philosophical systems, 100 ff
Pippalādakas, 229
Plati, 140
Polyphemus, 61
Prabhākara, 91, 190, 199, 209
Pradhāna, 98, 102, 223
Prajāpati, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 71, 73, 90, 182, 183
Prakṛiti, 98, 102, 222
Pramaganda, 62
Praśna Upanishad, 98
Prasthāna-bheda, 101 ff.
Pratridaḥ, 143
Praudhi-vāda, 224
Prāvahaṇi, 60, 61, 63, 112
Priyamedhas, 117
Prosody, 19
Pulastya, 188
Pulaha, 188
Puṇḍarīkāxa, 198
Purāṇas 2, 8, 17, 22, 24, 39, 40, 50, 94 ff., 101, 104 f., 186 f.
Purūravas, 27 ff., 104
Purusha, 10, 43, 82, 83, 87, 161, 199, 222, 226, 227
Purusha-medha, 35
Purusha-sūkta (R. V. x. 90, 1, 9), 10, 43, 50, 198, 227
Pūrva-mīmānsa Sūtras quoted, 52 ff., 69, 85 f., 190
Pūshan, 123, 161, 180

R.

Raghus, 202
Raghuvaṅśa, 60
Rahūgaṇas, 138
Rājās, 29, 102
Rājasūya sacrifice, 96
Rāmānujas, 102
Rāmāyaṇa, 60
Rathantara, 173
Rationalistic treatises, 13, 103
Raxases, 38, 120
Ṛi (to move, send forth), 136
Ṛibhus, 133, 159
Ṛich, 121, 165
Ṛik-verses, 7
Rig-veda, quotations from,
First Mandala—
1, 2,—117
3, 11, 12,—151
12, 11,—121
18, 6, 7,—156
20, 1,—129
22, 10,—151
27, 4,—122
31, 1, 2,—147
31, 11,—151
31, 18,—129
37, 4,—148
40, 5, 6,—158
48, 14,—117
60, 3,—122
60, 5,—138
61, 2,—137
61, 4,—137
61, 16,—129
66, 2,—147
67, 3,—173
77, 5,—138
78, 5,—138
80, 16,—117
89, 3,—122
91, 11,—138
94, 1,—137
96, 2,—122
102, 1,—138
109, 1, 2, 4,—152
116, 1,—136
117, 25,—129
118, 3,—117
130, 6,—131
130, 10,—122
131, 6,—117
139, 9,—117
143, 1,—122
152, 5,—149
164, 5, 6,—177
164, 25,—173
164, 37,—177
171, 2,—131
175, 6,—117
179, 2,—141
183, 6,—138
Second Mandala—
1, 2,—159
3, 8,—152
17, 1,—122
19, 8,—131

Rig-veda *continued.*
Second Mandala—
23, 2,—158
24, 1,—122
35, 2,—131
39, 8,—129
Third Mandala—
1, 20,—123
2, 1,—133
18, 3,—152
21, 3,—147
29, 15,—144
30, 20,—129
32, 14,—152
39, 1,—123
43, 5,—144
53, 9,—144
53, 12,—173
54, 17,—159
58, 3,—117
62, 7,—123
62, 10,—6, 161
Fourth Mandala—
3, 16,—138
5, 3,—156
5, 6,—157
6, 1,—157
6, 11,—129
11, 3,—157
16, 20,—129
20, 5,—117
32, 12,—138
34, 1,—152
43, 1, 2,—153
50, 1,—118
Fifth Mandala—
2, 11,—131
11, 5,—139
22, 4,—139
29, 1,—147
35, 4,—173
40, 6,—173
42, 6,—118
42, 13,—123
45, 4,—139
55, 8,—123
Sixth Mandala—
14, 2,—147
16, 47,—132
17, 13,—123
18, 15,—159
19, 4,—118
21, 5,—118
21, 8,—118
22, 2,—118
22, 7,—124
26, 3,—159
32, 1,—132
34, 1,—124
38, 3,—139

Rig-veda *continued.*
Sixth Mandala—
44, 13,—124
47, 3,—162
47, 10,—159
48, 11,—124
49, 1,—124
50, 6,—124
50, 15,—118
62, 4,—124
75, 19,—174
Seventh Mandala—
7, 6,—132
15, 4,—133
18, 1,—118
19, 11,—174
22, 9,—133
26, 1,—133
29, 4,—118
31, 11,—134
33, 3,—174
33, 7–14,—142, 143
34, 1,—153
34, 9,—153
53, 1,—119
53, 2,—124
56, 23,—124
59, 4,—125
61, 2,—136
61, 6,—125
64, 4,—132
66, 11,—164
67, 5,—139
76, 4,—119
85, 1,—139
87, 4,—144
88, 4,—144
90, 3,—153
91, 1,—119
93, 1,—125
94, 1, 2,—134
96, 3,—153
97, 3, 5,—159, 160
97, 9,—130
Eighth Mandala—
3, 3,—146
5, 18,—139
5, 24,—125
6, 10,—146
6, 11,—125
6, 33,—132
6, 41,—147
6, 43,—125
8, 8,—140
12, 10,—125
12, 14,—156
12, 31,—136
13, 7,—160
13, 26,—136
15, 7,—174

Rig-veda *continued.*
Eighth Mandala—
16, 7,—147
20, 19,—125
23, 14,—125
25, 24,—126
27, 11,—140
36, 7,—119
39, 6,—126
40, 12,—126
41, 2,—126
41, 5, 6,—163
44, 12,—126
48, 3,—162
49, 9,—174
51, 4,—130
55, 11,—127
63, 7, 8,—127
64, 6,—51, 58, 164
65, 5, 6, 12,—127
77, 4,—134
84, 4, 5,—134
88, 4,—149
89, 3, 4,—151
89, 10, 11,—150
90, 16,—150, 153
Ninth Mandala—
9, 8,—127
25, 5,—163
33, 5,—153
42, 2,—127
62, 1,—71
73, 2,—135
76, 4,—163
87, 3,—145
91, 5,—127
92, 3,—164
95, 1,—135
95, 2,—163
96, 11,—119
96, 5–7,—163
96, 18,—147
99, 4,—127
107, 7,—147
110, 7,—119
Tenth Mandala—
4, 5,—157
4, 6,—128
7, 2,—135
14, 15,—120
20, 10,—149
21, 5,—157
23, 5–7,—135
26, 4,—161
27, 22,—148
35, 6,—153
39, 14,—132, 164
42, 1,—140
54, 6,—130
56, 14,—120

Rig-veda *continued.*
Tenth Mandala—
57, 2,—227
57, 3,—227
61, 7,—149
62, 1, 3,—141
62, 4, 5,—142
63, 17,—140
67, 1,—136
71, 1-6,—154
71, 3,—73
72, 1, 2,—145
79, 1,—145
80, 7,—133
88, 18,—177
89, 3,—128
90, 1,—43
90, 9,—10, 50, 198, 227
91, 8,—157
91, 13,—128
91, 14,—136
96, 5,—120
96, 10,—155
96, 11,—128
98, 9,—120
101, 2,—130
107, 6,—140
109, 4,—146
110, 8,—155
111, 1,—140
112, 5,—148
112, 9,—160
114, 8, 9,—174
115, 5,—148
116, 9,—137
125, 3-5,—155
129, 5,—45, 178
129, 6,—46, 180
129, 5-7,—178
130, 1-7,—175
139, 5,—158
154, 2, 5,—146
167, 1,—146
176, 2,—156
177, 1,—156
190, 1,—146
Rishis, 5, 89 f., 95, 107, 109 ff.
——— distinguished as new and old, 116
——— speak of themselves as authors of hymns, 128 ff.
———, supernatural character ascribed to, 141 ff.
——— conscious of divine inspiration, 148 ff., 164 f.
——— their opposite views how reconcileable, 171 f.
Rishis, their confessions of ignorance, 177 f.
———, their idea of inspiration different from that of later writers, 179 f.
——— rival the gods, 180 f.
Ritual, 18
Röer, Bibliotheca Indica, 7, 8, 19, 96, 100, 150, 181, 187, 216
Romaharshaṇa, 22
Roth, Illustrations to Nirukta, see Nirukta.
Roth's Lexicon, see Boehtlingk and Roth.
Rudra, 16, 46 f., 161
Rudras, 69, 130

S.

S'abara, 190
Sadasaspati, 156
Sagara, sons of, 97, 99
S'akhas of the Veda, 11, 20, 39, 60, 83, 215
Sāma-rathantara, 7
Sāma-veda, impurity of its sound, 15, 16
Sāma-veda quoted, 71, 132, 134, 135, 137, 146, 147, 149, 161, 163, 174
Sāman, 121, 143
Sāma verses, 7, 176
S'amī wood, 28
Sāmidhenis, 79
S'aṁsa, 121
Sanaka, 188
Sanatkumāra, 186 f.
Sanhitās of the Veda, 19, 27, 104, 106
S'ankara Achāryya, 45, 52, 65 ff., 83, 94 ff., 101, 104 f., 178, 180, 182, 187, 188, 207, 213, 223
Sānkhyas, 98 f., 102, 203
Sānkhya, 101, 112, 220 ff.
——— Aphorisms, 81 ff., 105
Sānkhya-kārikā, 86, 162
Sānkhya-pravachana-bhāshya, 217 ff.
S'antanu, 26
Saptadasa-stoma, 7
Sarasvatī, goddess, 10, 23, 151, 152, 153, 155, 170, 180
———, mother of the Vedas, 10
S'ārīraka Sūtras, 65
S'ārīraka-mīmānsā-bhāshya, 66
Sarva-darśana-sangraha, 190 ff.
S'atapatha Brāhmana quoted, 3, 7, 29, 36, 113, 120
Sattva guna, 11, 102, 185
Satyavāha, 18
Satyavatī, 27
S'aunaka, 18
S'aunakas, 37
Savitṛi, 161, 176
Sāvitrī, 6
Sāyaṇa, Vedārthaprakāśa, or commentary on R. V., 40 ff., 51, 59, 61, 63, 106, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 129, 131, 132 f., 138, 147, 149, 151, 157, 159, 173, 178, 179, 226
Sāxāt-krita-dharman, 210
Siddhānta-muktāvali, 216
S'iva, 35, 161, 188
S'ikshā, 58, 105
S'inśapa (sisu), tree, 204
S'lokas, 8, 104
Smṛiti, 13, 43, 44 ff., 91, 93, 95 f., 100, 198, 223
Sobhari, 125
Soma, god, 119, 127, 135, 138, 147, 148, 164, 176, 180
———, source of inspiration, 162 f.
Soma, juice, 152
Somaśarman, 201
Souls, diversity of, 98
Sound, eternity of, 52 ff.
Speech, 5, 108, 150
Sphoṭa, 25, 72, 84 f.
S'ramaṇa, 187
S'ruti, 1, 11, 13, 100
Stoma, 121
Stuti, 121
S'ūdras, 50, 66
Sūkta, 121
Sumati, 121
Sumantu, 22, 24, 27, 190
Sun, 3 ff., 43
Superior science, 18
Sushṭuti, 121
Sūrya, 170
Sūta, 22, 24
Sūtras or Aphorisms, 8, 39, 104
Svadhā, 150, 178
Svāhā, 150
Svar, 3, 4, 6, 10
Svarbhānu, 173 f.

Svayambhū, 5, 71, 73, 83, 90
Svāyambhuva manvantara, 22, 23
S'vetāśvatara, sage, 181
———— Upanishad, 96, 100, 181
S'yāvāśva, 119

T.

Taittirīyas, 33
Taittirīya Brahmana [?], 173, 227
———— Sanhitā, 88
———— S'ākhā 60, 87, 200
———— Upanishad, 98
———— Yajur-veda, 35
Tamas, 102, 224
Tāmasa works, 224
Tapas, 146, 181
Tarka-sangraha, 209 f., 216
Tax (to fabricate), 128, 130
Thamyris, 166
Theogonia, 165 ff.
Thestor, 168
Threefold science, 28
Tiraśchī, 134
Tittiri, 33, 60, 87
Tretā yuga, 20, 27 ff.
Trisarvī, 35
Trishtubh, 7
Tritsus, 174
Trivṛit, 7
Tvashṭri, 149

U.

Udayana, 180, 191, 203, 204, 206, 211 ff.
Udgātṛi, 3
Uktha, 7, 121, 143, 174, 176
Ulysses, 166
Upanishads, 1, 2, 8, 17, 26, 40, 103 ff., 106, 181, 226
Upapuranas, 17
Urvaśī, 27 ff., 104, 143
Uśanas, 145
Ushas, 139
Ushmas, 26
Ushnih metre, 7, 176
Utpannatva, 199

V.

Vāch, 73, 108, 121, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 170, 180
Vachas, 121
Vāgīśvara, 191, 202
Vājasaneyins, 36
Vājasaneyi ritual, 35
———— Sanhita, or white Yajur-veda, quoted, 35, 120, 146, 155, 161, 227
Vājins, 33, 35
Vairūpa, 7
Vaiśampāyana, 22, 24, 27, 32 ff., 35, 190
Vaiśeshika, 95, 220, 225
Vaishṇavas, 102
Vaisvānara (Agni), 133
Vaivasvata Manvantara, 21, 22, 27
Vaktratunda (Ganeśa), 161
Vālakhilyas, 145, 160
Vālmīki, 60, 89
Varuṇa, 124, 132, 136, 139, 143, 144, 149, 170, 176, 180
————, source of inspiration, 160, 163 f.
Varūtrī, 151
Vashat, 150
Vashatkāra, 10
Vasishtha, 142 ff., 153, 174, 179
Vasishthas, 120, 143
Vāstoshpati, 149
Vasus, 69 f., 130
Vatsa, 140
Vātsāyana, 210
Vāyu, 119, 170
Vāyu Purana, 17, 22, 33, 35
Vāsudeva, 97
Vedāngas, 58, 91
Vedānta, 101 ff.
———— Sūtras, 65 ff.
Vedantists, 102, 179 f.
Vedārtha-prakāśa on R. V., 40
———————— on T. S., 5, 44, 47 ff., 88 f., 90
Vedas, their elemental origin, 3 ff.
————, world formed from, 4, 5, 71
———— issued from Brahma's mouth, 6 f.
————, breath of great Being, 7 f., 83 f., 104 f., 212
———— identified with speech, mind, and life, 8
———— identified with Vishnu, 11, 16
Vedas sprung from the Gāyatrī, 9
———— sprung from Sarasvatī, 10
———— sprung from Purusha, 10
———— sprung from time, 11
———— sprung from remainder of sacrifice, 227
———— classed with other S'āstras by the Upanishads, 8, 105 ff.
————, power, dignity, etc., of, 12 ff.
————, division of, 11, 20 ff.
————, original extent of, 21, 22
————, mutual hostility of the different schools of, 36 ff.
————, arguments in support of their authority, 39 ff., 52 ff., 73 ff., 86 ff., 196 ff., 212 ff.
————, eternity of, asserted, 11, 52 ff., 69 ff., 107, 164, 196 ff.
————, eternity of, denied, 73 ff., 81 ff., 211 ff.
———— superior to other S'āstras, 90 ff.
———— self-proving power, 107 f.
———— seen by the rishis, 107, 109
————, remarks on the arguments in support of, 108 ff.
———— really composed by the rishis, 109 ff., 114
———— contrasted with later S'āstras, 114
————, character and contents, 2, 109 ff., 114 f.
————, distinction of new and old hymns in, 116 ff.
————, see Rishis
Vedic Sanhitas, 103
Vedhas, 116
Vedavyāsa, see Vyāsa.
Verbal Divinity, 188 f.
Videha, 38
Vidvan-moda-taranginī, 208
Vijñāna Bhikshu, 81, 209, 217 ff.
Vidyā, 104
Vimada, 135, 136, 149
Vimadas, 135
Vipaśchit, 116

Vipra, 116
Virāj metre, 7, 176
Virūpa, 51, 58, 164
Vishṇu, 11 ff., 20, 24, 35, 99, 160, 163, 189, 198, 225
Vishnu Purāna quoted, or referred to, 4, 6, 11, 16, 20 ff., 31, 100, 210, 224
Viśvāmitra, 144 f., 173, 179, 181
Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭācharyya, 73, 217
Viśvāvasu, 158
Visvedevas, 70, 176
Vṛihad Āraṇyaka Upanishad, 7 ff., 38, 71, 103 ff., 108, 150, 180, 187, 217
Vṛihaduktha, 130
Vrihat-sāma, 7
Vṛihaspati, god, 118, 154, 158, 176
———, heretical teacher, 225
Vṛihaspati, author of a smṛiti, 92
Vṛittra, 125, 127
Vyāhṛitis, 26
Vyākhyānas, 105
Vyāsa, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 60, 73, 88, 190, 221, 224

W.

Weber Ind. Lit., 35
——— Ind. Stud. 4, 36 ff., 100, 101
——— Vāj. Sanhitā, 190
——— Vāj. San. Spec., 173
Wilson, H. H., 2
——— translation of Vishnu Purana, 4, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29, 31, 35, 99, 100, 146, 210, 224, 225
Wilson, H. H., translation of Rig-veda, 152, 177
——— Sānkhya kārikā, 25, 162

Y.

Yajñadatta, 70
Yājña-paribhāshā, 44
Yājñavalkya, 32 ff, 38
Yajur-veda, see Veda, and Taittirīya and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās.
Yajush, 121
Yajush-verses, 7
Yama (Agni?), 143
Yama, 146
Yāska, see Nirukta.
Yātudhāna, 110
Yoga aphorisms, 224
—— philosophy, 220
Yogas, 85, 102
Yogis, 222
Yugas, 22, 106

THE END.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

MAR 2 9 1929

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

3 9999 09948 576 3